



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:


- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

# **A scriptural view of the office of the Holy Spirit**

**Robert Richardson**



600











A SCRIPTURAL VIEW  
OF THE  
OFFICE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

BY  
R. RICHARDSON.

---

"For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit, and in much assurance."—1 THESS. i, 5.

"Not to avow the Holy Spirit in his work, is to be ashamed of the gospel, and of the promise of Christ, as if it were not to be owned in the world."—DR. JNO. OWEN.

---

CINCINNATI:  
CHASE & HALL, PUBLISHERS,  
180 ELM STREET,  
1875.

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1872, by  
BOSWORTH, CHASE & HALL,  
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

---

STEREOTYPED AT THE FRANKLIN TYPE FOUNDRY, CIN'TI.



AUG - 8 1921

RT4

142118

R52

## PREFACE.

It is the design of the following treatise to present the teaching of Scripture, in reference to the work of the Holy Spirit, in the salvation of men. It is not its purpose to enter minutely into all the questions connected with this important subject, but, while considering such of these as have an immediate practical relation to the present wants of religious society, to give a clear and distinct view of the entire office of the Holy Spirit, as this relates both to the Church and to the World. Conscious of no bias in favor of any particular theory, the author bespeaks, for the views he has to present, a fair examination in a candid and truth-loving spirit, and in the light of the Scriptures to which reference is made, taken in their proper connection and meaning.

The author has for many years contemplated, with much regret, the extremes into which men have fallen in relation to the subject of the Holy Spirit, nor has he failed to use his endeavors to correct these—especially those of them which rest on *rationalism*, a form of error to which certain religious reformers, who profess to take the “Bible alone,” seem to be peculiarly liable. Such are the infirmities of human nature, that a mere maxim, a denominational watch-word, a party-phrase, will sometimes so occupy the mind as to leave no room for the entire truth of which it is itself but a fragment, and the partial and imperfect conceptions thence resulting will lead inevitably to the most serious mistakes, both theoretical and practical. It would be impossible to estimate, for instance, the injury that has been done to religious society by the constant reiteration of the unscriptural expression, “Justification by faith alone,” which has led men to condemn not only the works of the Jewish law, but the ordinances of the Gospel itself, and the very obedience which faith itself requires in order to its own perfecting. Nor can it be determined how much of evil has, in like manner, proceeded from the brief but equally unscriptural phrase, “The Bible alone,” employed in a sense and for a purpose altogether alien to its true significance, and its original application. And yet how true are both these utterances! How precious the truth that we are “justified by faith *alone*,” when we refer only to the principle or ground of justification! How

(iii)

credible the famous saying that "the Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants," when understood, as first employed, to signify that "the Bible is a perfect rule of their faith and actions."\* How readily, however, the former truth may be transformed into an error when "faith" is resolved into an abstraction, and set in opposition to its own works, as if by these it was vitiated and annulled! How marked the potency of this extreme over even the mind of Luther, when he was led to call in question the genuineness of the epistle of James, because, in contradiction of the above assertion, it said that "by works a man is justified and not by faith only!" And how false the declaration that "the Bible only is the religion of Protestants," if this be made to mean that the *book* so termed, or even the professed acceptance of the truth of its teachings, constitutes, in point of fact, the religion of the Protestant world! Yet how many there may be who mistake a reverence for the things of religion for religion itself! How many who may amuse themselves with the idea that in possessing the word of truth, they possess also the truth! How many professed reformers may there be to whom the Gospel has truly come "in word only," and who seem unable to make their way out of the cocoon of formalism, which enwraps them and their religion in perpetual immaturity!

A true religious Reformation, however, will restore Christianity not only in *letter* but in *spirit*; not only in *principle* but in *practice*. The Gospel has not been given to men to be broken into pieces for the amusement of those who are but children in understanding, but that it may present to the weary and the thirsty soul, in its unsevered and sacred chalice, the "living water" of a divine salvation. If it fails to do this, it is because it is no longer entire, but has been rendered fragmentary and imperfect by the unfaithfulness or incapacity of those to whose charge it has been committed. History, indeed, reveals that the unhallowed ambitions of lordly prelates, the arrogant decrees of councils and of popes, the increasing corruptions of ignorance and superstition amidst ages of darkness, had indeed almost wholly obscured and perverted the Divine truths of the primitive gospel, when the reformation of Luther rescued, in part, the church from bondage and the Bible from the priests. But it likewise shows that an undue reliance upon human leaders, and a false confidence in human systems, speedily induced a state of things scarcely less fatal to Christianity. Leaving the doctrine of Christ, which teaches men to *do* right, Protestants allowed themselves to be carried away by a blind zeal for doctrines and religious theories in hopes to make men *think* right. Some favorite opinion, coined in the brain of an aspiring teacher, was permitted to acquire unjust authority, and to array in its support a forced and unwilling troop of scripture "texts." Opposing systems marshaled their respective battalions, placing opinion against opinion and scripture against scripture. Those who

---

\* "Religion of Protestants," p. 463. Bohn's Edition.

should have been united in a common brotherhood, contending earnestly for "the faith once delivered to the saints," have wasted their resources, embittered their lives, and misused their opportunities in unhallowed conflicts with each other. Party names, party standards, party watch-words have been matters of chief concern, while charity, unity, righteousness and peace have been left to perish. Some mere fragment of Divine truth, eked out by empty speculation, and decked in the flimsy trappings of human imagination, has been allowed to usurp an absolute authority soon to be questioned and perhaps overthrown by some rival pretender to ecclesiastical dominion. Thus the history of Protestantism is little else than the history of the rise and fall of sects, the record of religious revolutions and eager struggles for denominational supremacy.

The chief cause of this unhappy, divided, and distracted condition of religious society has been the assumption by the "clergy" of the exclusive right of interpreting the Scriptures. "He," says Chillingworth, "that would usurp an absolute lordship and tyranny over any people, need not put himself to the trouble and difficulty of abrogating and disannulling the laws made to maintain the common liberty; for he may frustrate their intent, and compass his own design as well, if he can get the power and authority to interpret them as he pleases, and add to them what he pleases, and to have his interpretations and additions stand for laws—if he can rule his people by his laws, and his laws by his lawyers."\* In this way one of the fundamental principles of Protestantism, "the right of private judgment," has in a good degree been rendered null, and the gift of the Bible to the "laity" unavailing.

Against these evils and their causes the peace-loving and truth-loving among the Protestants have indeed again and again protested. "This presumptuous imposing," said the author just quoted, "of the senses of men upon the words of God, the special senses of men upon the general words of God, and laying them upon men's consciences together, under the equal penalty of death and damnation; this vain conceit, that we can speak of the things of God better than in the words of God; this deifying our own interpretations, and tyrannous forcing them upon others; this restraining the word of God from that latitude and generality, and the understandings of men from that liberty wherein Christ and the apostles left them, is and hath been the only fountain of all the schisms of the church, and that which makes them immortal. Take away these walls of separation, and all will quickly be one. Take away this persecuting, burning, cursing, damning of men for not subscribing to the words of men as the words of God; require of Christians only to believe Christ, and to call no man master but him only; let those leave claiming infallibility that have no title to it, and let them that in their words disclaim it, disclaim it likewise in their actions. In a

---

\* "Religion of Protestants," p. 90.



word, take away tyranny, which is the devil's instrument to support errors, and superstitions, and impieties in the several parts of the world, which could not otherwise long withstand the power of truth; I say, take away tyranny, and restore Christians to their just and full liberty of captivating their understanding to Scripture only; and as rivers, when they have a free passage, run all to the ocean, so it may well be hoped, by God's blessing, that universal liberty, thus moderated, may quickly restore Christendom to truth and unity."\*

These weighty words were uttered nearly two centuries and a half ago, and though they have been so long unheeded, there is now reason to hope that the important truths they affirm are beginning to pervade the Protestant world, and that the hour is not distant when a successful effort may be made to unite all believers under one Divine Leader, and to extend the triumphs of the Gospel to the ends of the earth. The signs of the times clearly indicate that a more liberal feeling is extending itself among those who profess Christianity, and that they are becoming awakened to a sense of the evils of disunion, and of the great benefits likely to result from co-operation in the cause of Christ. Nor are the workings of Divine Providence less marked in the rapidly increasing facilities for introducing the gospel among nations heretofore buried in ignorance and idolatry, and in the humbling of those proud dynasties which have heretofore resisted all religious progress, and endeavored to maintain the rule of superstition. In the swift changes now occurring, may the people of God be wisely guided, and may the Good Spirit of our God, through whose pervading presence alone unity can be established in the body of Christ, direct the hearts of all believers into the love of God and of each other, to the furtherance of the truth and the salvation of the world!

---

\* "Religion of Protestants," p. 250.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

Genesis of the Old Testament—Genesis of the New—Anointing of Jesus by the Spirit—Christ's Function to Baptize in the Holy Spirit and in Fire—Holy Spirit a prominent subject in his Teachings—His Farewell Discourse. Pages 11–28.

## CHAPTER II.

Christ's Prayer for the Holy Spirit—Not an Intercessory Prayer—Why recorded—Its Peculiar Features—Its Limitation to the Disciples—Relation of the Holy Spirit to Christian Unity—Analysis of the Prayer of Christ—Its main Purport, Pages 29–47.

## CHAPTER III.

Christ's Prayer not for "Christian Union"—First Disciples already united—Difficulties—Distinction between *Union* and *Unity*—Unity the "Unity of the Spirit"—How Maintained and Lost—A Divine Gift—World not converted by *Union* but by *Unity*—This a Constant Result—The Divine Promises. Pages 48–67.

## CHAPTER IV.

Objections of Materialists—Matter and Spirit differ in Nature—Original Facts undemonstrable—Demoniac Possessions—Satanic Power  
(vii)

—The Indwelling of the Spirit—Distinguishable from an Incarnation—From the Divine Omnipresence—The Term Guest Inappropriate—The Spirit not to be confounded with the Word.  
Pages 68-87.

## CHAPTER V.

John's Version of the Commission—Holy Spirit not given until after Christ's Ascension—Election of Matthias not ratified—Advent of the Comforter—Its great Importance—Completion of the Redemptive Work—The Gift of the Holy Spirit—Literal and Real.  
Pages 88-100.

## CHAPTER VI.

Metaphorical Expressions relating to the Gift of the Spirit—*Outpouring, Drinking, Baptizing*—Various Impartations of the Spirit, direct, indirect—The Fact the same in all Cases—Unity effected by one Spirit—Supernatural Powers a transient Accompaniment.  
Pages 101-127.

## CHAPTER VII.

The Kingdom of Heaven—Its Nature and Design—Supernatural Powers in the Primitive Church—Paul's Reasoning in regard to them—Test of Discipleship—Martyrdom—Spiritual Gifts—Their Purposes—Miraculous Faith—The Human Will—Spiritual Gifts to be Distinguished from the Permanent Fruits of the Spirit.  
Pages 128-150.

## CHAPTER VIII.

Manifestations of the Spirit prior to Pentecost—Compared with Miraculous Powers of Apostolic Age—Differ from the Gift of the Holy Spirit—Speculation and Sensuism—Different Dispensations of Religion—Position of the People of God under the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Institutions. Pages 151-178.

## CHAPTER IX.

Permanent Fruits of the Spirit—Nature of the Change produced in the Disciples at Pentecost—Renovation due to the Presence of the Spirit—Effects the same in all—Not from Ethical Precepts or Example—New Testament now replaces Supernatural Gifts, but not the Paraclete—The Impartation of the Spirit, the Design of the Gospel Ministry—An Earnest, a Seal, a Witness—Interior State of the Believer—Scripture the only Test of Religious Truth and Feeling—Love the Fulfilling of the Law. Pages 179–208.

## CHAPTER X.

Means of obtaining the Holy Spirit—Faith, Obedience, Prayer—Example of Christ—Household of Cornelius, an Exceptional Case—Importance of the Gospel Order—Unavailing if alone—Delusions—Value of Truth—Requirements of the Church—Larger Measures of Spiritual Power—Efficient means of Perfection and Christian Unity. Pages 209–225.

## CHAPTER XI.

Influence of the Spirit in Conversion confounded with the Gift of the Spirit—Modern Views—State of the Question—Office of the Spirit in relation to the World—Conviction of Sin, of Righteousness, of Judgment—Accomplished by the Divine Testimony—Results of Modern Theories—Theories Unnecessary. Pages 226–251.

## CHAPTER XII.

The Nature and Necessity of Regeneration generally agreed upon—Importance of the Change—How Represented in Scripture—Not an Act but a Process—Different Parts of this Process—Baptism, how related to it—Extreme Views—Scripture the only Guide. Pages 252–274.

## CHAPTER XIII.

Theories of Faith—False View of Regeneration—Spirit never given prior to Belief—Power of the Gospel—Superadded Agencies—Truth as a Power, as an Instrumentality—Change of Heart—Mode in which Truth acts—Theory of “Spiritual Operations” Unnecessary. Pages 275–298.

## CHAPTER XIV.

The Gospel a Divine Message—A Person and not Doctrines the Object of Faith—Christianity a Life—Parable of the Sower—Obstacles to the Reception of the Gospel—Their Removal—Theories of Conversion Unnecessary—Full Assurance of Faith—Influences of the Spirit, external, internal. Pages 299–325.

THE  
OFFICE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

---

CHAPTER I.

Genesis of the Old Testament—Genesis of the New—Anointing of Jesus by the Spirit—Christ's Function to Baptize in the Holy Spirit and in Fire—The Holy Spirit a Prominent Subject in his Teachings—His Farewell Discourse.

THERE is no subject more important in religion than that of the Holy Spirit. Unless this be properly understood, a large portion of the Bible, and especially of the New Testament, must remain unintelligible. On the other hand, a just view of it will do more than a knowledge of any other particular topic to give harmony, clearness, and consistency to what may be learned of all other matters presented in the Word of God. That Word has been itself dictated by the Spirit, and the better our knowledge of the Author, the more correct will be our comprehension of the entire volume. That the subject is, from its very nature, difficult and mysterious in many respects, is freely admitted; but it is equally true that, so far as it is treated at all in Scripture, it is a legitimate subject of human inquiry, and an essential portion of religious truth.



In the Old Testament the Spirit is introduced in the very beginning of the material creation, as 'moving upon,' or brooding over, "the face of the waters." When mentioned, he is usually termed the "Spirit of Jehovah," the "Holy Spirit of Jehovah," Ps. li: 2; the "Spirit of God" or the "Good Spirit of Jehovah," Ps. cxliii: 10; Neh. x: 20. He is spoken of as the source, giver and sustainer of life, Job xxvii: 3; xxxiii: 4; Gen. ii: 7; as the source of Divine intelligence, Gen. xli: 38; Deut. xxxiv: 9; of mechanical skill, xxviii: 3, etc.; of supernatural gifts, Numb. xxiv: 2, etc. He is again referred to as "changing the heart" of Saul—*i. e.*, as bestowing upon him prophetic inspiration—I Sam. x: 10. His departure from one to whom he had imparted any special grace is called the departure of God, I Sam. xvi: 14; and his presence is called the presence of God, I Sam. xvi: 13, etc. The references to the Spirit, however, in the Old Testament, are comparatively few, and we will defer to a future occasion what we have to say as to the nature of his office prior to the advent of Christ. It will suffice to remark here that it was chiefly in the inspiration of the prophets, and in the miraculous powers conferred upon them, that the agency of the Spirit was then recognized. The ordinary gifts or fruits of the Spirit, however, which were to be more fully displayed under the Christian Institution, are referred to by Isaiah, xi: 1-5; lxi.

As it is in the New Testament that this subject is chiefly developed, it will be proper to direct to this

our first and principal attention. Here we find that, just as the Holy Spirit is introduced in the beginning of the material creation, so is he introduced also in the beginning of the new or spiritual creation. He appears, in the Old Testament, as the active agent in the *genesis* of the heavens and of the earth; and in the very first chapter of the New Testament this same Divine Spirit is presented to our view in the *genesis* of Christ. "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee," said the angel to Mary, "and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee. Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Elsewhere he is termed "the first-born of every creature,"\* the Alpha and the Omega, "the Amen, the faithful and true Witness," the Beginning of the creation of God, "the Word that in the beginning was with God and was God," and "by whom all things were created that are in heaven and that are in earth, whether visible or invisible," material or spiritual. Col. i: 16.

---

\* Col. i: 15. Christ was "the first-born" (πρωτότοκος) "of every creature;" not in the sense of the possessive genitive, but in that of the genitive of the *point of view*—'in reference to.' That is, he was begotten antecedently to created things. Ellicott *in loco*. Again, he was "first-born" (πρωτότοκος) in respect to his mother Mary. Matt. i: 25. He was also "first-born" (πρωτότοκος) "among many brethren"—of those who, as sons of God, were brought into the kingdom of heaven; and finally he was "the first-born" (πρωτότοκος, Rev. i: 5) "from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence"—that he might be in all these respects first and chief, since "it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell." Col. i:



It was to this "Head of all principality and power," this Word, now "made flesh," that the prophet foretold a special and plenary impartation of the Spirit for the work of the new creation. "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord, and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord; and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth; and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins." Isa. xi: 1-5. And again, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness, that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified." Isa. lxi: 1-3. It was after Jesus had been anointed with the Holy Spirit, and had returned to Nazareth,

that, standing up, as usual, to read in the synagogue, he received from the minister the book of the prophet Isaiah, and, having opened it and found the above passage, he thus announced its application: "This day," said he, "is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." Luke iv: 21.

The approach of the "Sun of righteousness," however, had not been unheralded. The morning star had already appeared to the nation of Israel as his Harbinger. John had already borne his testimony to Jesus, saying: "This was he of whom I spake. He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me." And, in harmony with the declaration of the ancient prophet, he had introduced him as one who was to "proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord," as well as "the day of vengeance of our God," when he said to the people, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire: Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather the wheat into the garner, but will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Matt. iii: 11, 12.

It had thus not only been foretold by the prophet that the Spirit of the Lord should rest on the expected Messiah, but it was now announced by John, as a special and distinguishing function of this coming One, that he would himself "baptize in the Holy Spirit." Furthermore, in order that John might be enabled certainly to recognize the Person thus com-

missioned, there was given to him a sign. "I knew him not," said he, "but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing in water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize in water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth in the Holy Spirit. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God." Jno. i: 31, 34. Thus was fulfilled what Isaiah had said: "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him," and what he had himself uttered by the mouth of Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings [gospel] unto the meek," etc., and this fulfillment is thus narrated by Luke: "It came to pass that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened and the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." iii: 21, 22. Thus also had it been announced by Isaiah: "Behold my Servant whom I uphold, mine Elect in whom my soul delighteth: I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles." xlii: 1.

Both the Father and the Holy Spirit are thus here presented to us as associated with Christ and with his work. He is sent by the Father, who announces him from the heavens, and by whom he is

anointed with the Holy Spirit, in order that he might fulfill the great purposes of his mission. The Spirit appears as the immediately effective power in Christ, who does not enter upon his public ministry until this gift is imparted. He was then about thirty years of age, and we are informed that the Spirit was given to him "not by measure." It was imparted in all its fullness to him, in whom it pleased the Father that all fullness should dwell, even "the fullness of the godhead bodily." Col. i: 19; ii: 9.\* From the moment of its reception, the life of Christ is characterized as under the immediate direction of the Spirit. He is at once "led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil." Subsequently, "he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee." Luke iv: 14. He 'cast out devils by the Spirit of God,' and all the mighty works which he performed, as well as the precious teachings which he uttered, he attributed to that Divine power ever within him. "The Father that dwelleth in me," said he, "he doeth the works." Jno. xiv: 10. Again, "He whom

---

\* This "fullness" of the Spirit seems implied in the language of Isa. xi: 1. This same fullness of power and knowledge is indicated in the Apocalypse, where Christ appears under the symbol of a Lamb as it had been slain, "having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth." The seven lamps of fire burning before the throne are also symbolic of "the seven Spirits of God." Rev. iv: 5. To the church of Sardis, it is written: "Thus saith he that hath the seven Spirits of God and the seven stars," the number "seven" being usually employed to denote fullness or completeness and perfection.

God hath sent, speaketh the words of God, for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." Jno. iii: 34. The entire work of redemption, indeed, is, in a certain sense, represented as accomplished by the Spirit. It was by the Spirit that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." "By an eternal Spirit" Christ "offered himself without spot to God." "He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit," etc.

Christ, however, not only thus accomplished the works of him that sent him, in signs and wonders and revelations of the truth, but also in the dispensation of the Holy Spirit to believers, which, as we have seen above, was committed to him. He was specially revealed to John the Baptist as "he that baptizeth in the Holy Spirit." From the manner in which this is announced, the vast importance evidently attached to it, and the fact that it is made a distinguishing characteristic of the ministry of Christ, it can not justly be supposed that this great function was fulfilled in the bestowment of the temporary and partial spiritual gifts of the apostolic age. Miraculous powers had been conferred before, and largely exercised, even under the Jewish Institution; but this was, evidently, from the very manner of its announcement, something never yet vouchsafed to men—a ministration which belonged peculiarly to Christ—a function which was to be exercised in reference to *an entire class*, without any intimation of limit or restriction as to its duration or its universality.

It was prior to his identification of Jesus that John,

impressed with the superior dignity and glory of the coming One, cried out to the multitude in the remarkable words already quoted: "I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather the wheat into the garner; but will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Having before him, on this occasion, the Pharisees and Sadducees, who had come to his baptism for certain selfish ends, and aware that the Messiah was not only "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord," but also "the day of vengeance of our God," he very naturally extends his views to that future judgment of the impenitent, and, denouncing them as "a generation of vipers," he inquires, in cutting irony, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" He then exposes their vain reliance upon mere Abrahamic descent, and admonishes them that the time was at hand when 'every tree which did not bring forth good fruit would be hewn down and cast into the fire.' In perfect harmony now with the circumstances and the entire connection of thought, he announces that the "mightier" One, whose advent he heralded, would, on the one hand, bless the righteous by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and, on the other, punish the wicked by a baptism in fire—carrying out the distinction and the contrast still further in the following verse, where he compares him

to the husbandman separating the chaff from the wheat, and, while gathering the former "into the garner," burning the latter "with unquenchable fire." The baptism in the Spirit is thus here placed in direct opposition to the baptism in fire—the former involving the salvation and blessedness of the redeemed, as an entire class, and the latter indicating the punishment prepared for the ungodly. Christ, himself, subsequently, employed similar language to that of John, in reference to the scribes and Pharisees: "Ye serpents," said he, "ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Matt. xxiii: 33.\*

---

\* As the "fire" spoken of by John the Baptist in the passage above quoted has been most erroneously regarded by some as denoting the Holy Spirit, a few additional comments may not be inappropriate. The following is the note of LANGÉ on Matt. iii; 11: "*I indeed baptize you in (ἐν) water* (immersing you in the element of water) UNTO REPENTANCE—The Baptist thus declares that he is not the judge, and, at the same time, that by his baptism of water he does not secure their salvation, but merely calls them to repentance. Lastly, he teaches them that his was merely a symbolical and temporary mission, as the forerunner, to prepare for the higher mission of the Messiah. HE THAT COMETH AFTER ME (immediately following me),=the Messiah. The Baptist here describes his personal relation to the Messiah: I AM NOT WORTHY TO BEAR HIS SANDALS, to carry them and to take them away—in Mark and Luke, to tie on and to unloose. Among the Jews, Greeks and Romans this was the function of the meanest slaves. (See Wetstein, Rosenmuller, Jahn.)—He proceeds to point out the relation of his baptism to that of Christ. HE SHALL BAPTIZE, or immerse, YOU IN THE HOLY GHOST AND IN FIRE.—He will either entirely immerse you in the Holy Ghost as penitents, or, if impenitent, he will overwhelm you with the fire of judgment (and at last with hell-fire). This interpretation of the expression 'fire' has been pro-

According to the view here taken of Christ's function in relation to the Holy Spirit, one of his appropriate designations might be, "He that baptizeth in

---

pounded by many of the Fathers (some of whom, however, referred it to the fire of purgatory); and among modern expositors by Kuinoel, Schott, Neander [De Wette, Meyer]. But some commentators, among them Erasmus [Chrys., Calv., Beng., Olshaus., Ebrard, Ewald, Alford, Wordsworth], apply the expression to the kindling, sanctifying fire of the Holy Ghost. The warning tone of the passage, and the expression UNQUENCHABLE FIRE, in verse 12, are against this interpretation. In some Codd. the words *καὶ πυρί* are omitted, probably from the erroneous supposition that they were equivalent to Holy Ghost."

Thus far Dr. Langé. On this, Dr. P. Schaff observes that "it is harsh to separate the 'Holy Spirit' and 'fire' as referring to different classes of persons, when they are clearly united in *ῥυαὶς* and by the copulative *καὶ* (not the disjunctive *ἢ*, aut)." There would be some force in this observation were it not that, in the context immediately preceding, the two classes of persons are *already* introduced, and that the contrast between them and the respective destiny of each is again presented in the following verse (12). The similitude used by John in verse 10, is employed by Christ himself near the close of the sermon on the mount, vii: 17-19, where he plainly refers to two classes of professors. Dr. Schaff goes on to affirm as follows: "This prophecy was literally fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples in tongues of fire. Acts ii: 3." The Scripture does not sustain Dr. Schaff in this assertion, so inconsistent with the comment of the more judicious Langé. The Scripture does not say, in Acts ii: 3, "*there appeared unto them*" *cloven tongues of fire*, but "*tongues like as of fire*" (*ὡσεὶ πυρός*)—a proposition quite as different from that of Dr. Schaff as truth in *appearance* is from truth *itself*, or a "show of wisdom" from wisdom. *Literally*, there was no "fire" whatever on the occasion. The "tongues like as of fire" were emblematic, and to suppose them a *literal* fulfillment of a figure used by John is to suppose absurdly that we have one figure fulfilled by another. Nothing could be more appropriate than such an 'appearance' on Pentecost, as indicative of the gift of languages and the in-



the Holy Spirit," just as we have, "He that cometh" (ὁ ἐρχόμενος), or "He that liveth," or "He that hath the seven Spirits of God." This baptism also is to be regarded as applicable to the entire class of be-

---

spiration then bestowed. It gave, as it were, visible expression to the particular powers then imparted, and indicated the penetrating and illuminating influence of the Word of God, now to be declared in the various tongues of earth. "Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord." Jer. xxiii: 29.

If it were at all allowable, in harmony with the context, to regard the saying, "He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire," as applicable to one class—the obedient, *only*—it would be still an error to make "fire" a symbol or a synonym for the Holy Spirit, since the Holy Spirit is here distinctly mentioned, so that to add to it "and fire" would be mere tautology. Furthermore, if both apply to believers, "fire" would have to be understood—not of the Holy Spirit, but of those afflictions and trials which they were to undergo, and which are elsewhere represented under the figure of "fire," and also under that of a "baptism." "Think not strange," says Peter, "of the *fiery* trial which is to try some of you." "The *fire* shall try every man's work"—*i.e.*, his converts—says Paul. "Every one shall be salted with fire, as every sacrifice is salted with salt," said Jesus, after he had counseled the disciples to cast into the fire any thing dear to them, as a hand or an eye, if it proved a snare, rather than to have the whole body cast into hell-fire. As faith is thus represented "tried by fire," so the afflictions and persecutions of believers are also compared to a baptism; as when Christ said to the sons of Zebedee, "Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of, and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized." Mark x: 39. "I am come to send fire on the earth," again said Jesus, Luke xii: 49; "and what will I, if it be already kindled? But I have a baptism to undergo, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?" Such figurative uses of "baptism" and of "fire" occur, but never conjoined, and when, in the case of John's declaration, the circumstances and the context are considered, the interpretation given by Langé must be regarded as the true one.

lievers, without exception, since there is nothing whatever in its announcement restricting it to a limited number or to a particular time. On the contrary, the manner of its announcement forbids any such restriction, and leaves it just as universal and as permanent, on the one hand, as the punishment of the wicked remains upon the other. As to the particular force of the expression, "baptize in the Holy Spirit," this will be considered more appropriately hereafter. It will be sufficient to say, at present, that it is regarded as referring simply to that impartation or communication of the Holy Spirit to believers which is equally true of all, since "if a man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his," and that it is hence a function which can terminate only with the close of the Christian dispensation. Christ is thus appropriately represented as the dispenser of this Divine gift to the Church, of which he is the head, throughout all the ages; while, on the other hand, as "all judgment is committed unto the Son," the punishing of the wicked, the baptism in fire, is, with equal propriety, assigned to him. "Behold," said the Lord by Malachi, in reference to this very ministry of John and of Jesus, "I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming, and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire

and like fuller's soap; and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness."—"For, behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts, and it shall leave them neither root nor branch."

Taking for granted, then, what will be more fully shown hereafter, that it was one of the great distinguishing functions of Christ to "baptize in the Holy Spirit," or, in other words, to impart the Holy Spirit to believers, we would naturally expect to find that, during his ministry, this particular matter would occupy prominently his attention. Even in advance of the period of its accomplishment, we would expect him, in his teachings, to dwell upon this great end or purpose of his mission. Conscious of its vast importance, he could not fail to direct the attention of his auditors to it as the essential matter in his ministry, and to seek to impress it upon them with peculiar earnestness. Accordingly, we find; upon even a cursory survey of his recorded instructions, that this subject presents itself with marked distinctness, and with a frequency and an earnestness entirely consonant with the view above given. In the most affectionate and impressive manner, he admonishes and exhorts his disciples, in anticipation of the appointed period when the Spirit was to be given, to ask, that they might receive; to seek, that

they might find; to knock, that it might be opened to them. "If a son shall ask bread," said he, "of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he, for a fish, give him a serpent? Or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him." Luke xi: 11-13. The Holy Spirit is, of course, in all cases, the gift of God, and we have here an assurance of its impartation to his children not less remarkable for its simple beauty and emphatic earnestness than for its universality. There is to be no exception whatever. If evil men can give good gifts to their children, much more shall the Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who are his children. They are, therefore, counseled to seek it diligently and perseveringly until their request be granted, as exemplified in the parable just preceding, verse 5-8. On another occasion he, in the most positive terms, assures the Jewish ruler that "the flesh profiteth nothing," and that "it is the Spirit that quickeneth." Again, seated by a well, in conversation with the woman of Samaria, he takes occasion to say that if she knew "the gift of God," and who it was who said to her, "Give me to drink," she would have asked of him, and he would have given her "living water." Standing, subsequently, amidst the concourse, on the great day of one of the national feasts, and with the purpose of his mission resting on his heart, he was moved to

cry aloud, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive. For the Holy Spirit was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)" Jno. vii: 37-39. A similar pressing sense of the sacredness and transcendent importance of the work of the Spirit, seems to have induced him to pronounce that strong condemnation of those who blasphemed the Holy Spirit, Matt. xii: 31, which, in every age, has aroused the consciences of men and stimulated to earnest inquiry.

It is, however, in his last interviews with his disciples, prior to his sufferings, when he was about to leave them, that, with a peculiar tenderness of feeling, he reveals to them, in explicit terms, his unity with the Father, and informs them that he will not leave them desolate, but will send them another Comforter or Paraclete, to abide with them forever. He assures them that he will thus come to them, and that, in receiving this promised Comforter, they would themselves realize that unity of which he had spoken, and know "that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you." This promise he conditions directly upon that obedience to his commandments which alone could evince love to God, and secure, in turn, the love of God, and that manifestation of the Spirit of which he had spoken. When asked by one of the disciples how he would manifest himself to them, and not unto the world, he reiterates in

still plainer language: "If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." Jno. xiv: 15-23. Again and again, in this touching farewell discourse to his disciples, does he assure them, as the special source of consolation, that he will send to them this Paraclete, "which is," said he, "the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name." xiv: 26.\* "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the

---

\* In the New Testament, the titles used to designate the Divine Spirit are: "The Holy Spirit," "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit of Christ," "The Spirit of [the] truth," or simply "The Spirit." In his farewell discourse Christ first introduces another title, "The Paraclete," found only in John, and by him, in his first epistle, applied to Christ, and translated *Advocate*. I Jno. ii: 1. Its etymon, the verb *parakaleo* (παρακαλέω), occurs often in the New Testament, and is rendered generally by *beseech*, *entreat*, *exhort*, or *comfort*. The noun Paraclete is found only five times—four times in Christ's farewell discourse, and once in I Jno. ii: 1. It has been variously rendered Comforter, Advocate, Monitor, Teacher, but chiefly by the two first. Most of the early Greek Fathers understood it in the sense of a Consoler; the early Latin Church, however, in that of Advocate. With the latter the term *advocate* had a wider meaning than with us, and does not now fairly represent either their idea or that of the Greek term Paraclete, both of these involving *counsel*, rather than *pleading*, to which "advocate" is now chiefly confined. Neither is the word *Comforter*, unless taken in a wide sense, as Helper, Strengtheners, Supporter, as well as Consoler, sufficient to give the full import of the Greek term. It is doubtless, however, the best word our language admits, and is most appropriate in Christ's discourse, in which comfort to his disciples, on account of his departure, was naturally prominent, while, in I Jno. ii: 1, Advocate is the better rendering.

Father, he shall testify of me." xv: 26. Finding that sorrow filled their hearts at the thought of his departure, he says again: "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth. It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." xvi: 7.

It was after giving these assurances and consolations to his disciples that, in their hearing and presence, Christ offered up the remarkable prayer recorded in Jno. xvii, which was the closing act of his ministry anterior to his betrayal in Gethsemane. As this prayer has a special relation to our subject, and as its scope and real purport seem to be scarcely at all understood by the religious community, it will now claim our particular attention.

## CHAPTER II.

Christ's Prayer for the Holy Spirit—Not an Intercessory Prayer—Why Recorded—Its Peculiar Features—Its Limitation to the Disciples—Relation of the Holy Spirit to Christian Unity—Analysis of the Prayer of Christ—Its Main Purport.

THE necessity of a loving obedience, in order to the reception of the Holy Spirit, is constantly maintained in Scripture. Peter said to the Jews: "We are witnesses of these things, and so also is the Holy Spirit which God gives *to them who obey him.*" It was in harmony with this principle that Christ said to his disciples, Jno. xiv: 15-17, "If ye love me, keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world can not receive because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." The "world"—that is, the *unbelieving*, and, consequently, *disobedient*, world—could not receive the Spirit. This blessedness was exclusively restricted to those who believed, who recognized God in Christ, and who followed and obeyed him. Hence it was made a specific condition that the disciples should manifest their love for Christ by obedience, in order



that, in answer to the prayer which he promised to offer, the Father should send to them another Comforter, who was to continue with them permanently. This prayer, accordingly, which Christ, at the close of his discourse, offered to the Father, in the presence of his disciples, is, we affirm, *his promised prayer for the Holy Spirit*, embracing all the specified conditions and all the designed and needed results. I am not aware that it has ever been by any one properly regarded in this point of view, in which alone, as I trust to make it evident, it can be rightly comprehended. It is not a prayer for Christian Union, in behalf of which it is constantly misquoted. It is not "The Intercessory Prayer," as theologists term it—darkening counsel by words without knowledge. Intercession implies parties at variance. Nothing of this kind appears in the prayer, or in the circumstances under which it was offered. There is no interceding for offenders in it. It is not intercessory in any sense in which all prayer for others may not be so termed. It consists simply of a statement of facts, and of those petitions which these facts warrant. The facts were not that the disciples had disobeyed, and that they needed intercession, but the very reverse of this, as Christ declares of them: "Thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and *they have kept thy word.*" "They have believed that thou didst send me." "I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me, *for they are thine.*" "I have given them thy word, and the world hath hated them because they are not of

the world, even as I am not of the world," etc. There is not a word in the prayer which could be properly termed intercessory, but, on the contrary, the attitude in which the disciples are placed in it throughout, shows clearly that they were regarded as entirely prepared to receive the great blessing, the burden of the whole prayer—that Divine *unity* which it is the office of the Holy Spirit to impart, and a prayer for which is equivalent to a direct petition for *the Spirit himself*.

In order, however, that the questions relating to this most remarkable prayer of Christ may be properly approached, we may remark that we might justly expect to find *on record* that prayer for the Comforter which he had promised to offer. This we should expect from—

1. *The Importance of such a Prayer.* The simple fact that Christ thought it necessary to inform his disciples *beforehand* of this intended special petition to the Father, implies that it was one of no ordinary moment. It was near the time of his own departure from them, and the promise was evidently given to comfort and sustain them, in view of the trial they were soon to experience in losing that personal watch-care which had heretofore guarded and preserved them. In announcing to his disciples, whom he affectionately terms "little children," that he could be with them but a little while; that they would vainly seek him, and could not then follow him, he says: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God; believe also in me;" and, after informing them that

he was going to prepare a place for them, and declaring to them the *unity* which existed between him and the Father, assuring them that whatsoever they should ask in his name he would do, "that the Father might be glorified in the Son," he goes on to say that if they loved him and kept his commandments, he would himself pray the Father, "and he shall send you," said he, "another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." Wonderful and mysterious as was to their partially enlightened minds that Word made flesh, whose glory had entranced, and whose power had kept them, they are informed that they are to have the comfort and support of "another Paraclete," whose presence was not to be withdrawn, but of whose nature, work, and office they could, as yet, have no adequate conception or anticipation. How important, then, to them at this moment was such a communication, and especially the promise that their beloved Lord would himself pray for and send to them this un hoped-for blessing! How hard to suppose that the fulfillment of a promise so important to the Church in all ages would fail to be noted by the apostle by whom the promise itself is recorded!

2. *The Usage of the Scriptures.* It is a very obvious and striking fact that when the fulfillment of a prediction falls within the period embraced by the Scripture narrative it is carefully recorded. Thus the accomplishment of the Old Testament prophecies in relation to Christ and his kingdom is carefully detailed in the New Testament. We find that,

in like manner, similar predictions given by Christ himself, or by Christian prophets, have their fulfillment carefully noted. Thus, on one occasion, Christ told the disciples that there were some standing among them who should, before their death, see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom; and in the next chapter we have the accomplishment of this in the transfiguration, when Peter, James, and John were permitted to witness, by anticipation, the glory of the exalted Redeemer. Again, when it is foretold to Peter that he would deny his Master, the actual occurrence of the denial is minutely recorded. So, also, we have the promise of the calling of the Gentiles, Jno. x: 16; Matt. xii: 21, etc., and the fulfillment, Acts x; the prediction of the betrayal, John xiii: 21, and its accomplishment, Jno. xviii; and many other cases which will occur to the Bible reader, both in the Old and the New Testament. From the latter we may adduce another example not generally recognized.

Christ said to Peter, xxi: 22, concerning John, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" Now we have, in the first chapter of the Apocalypse, the evident fulfillment of this intimation in the coming of Christ to the aged apostle in the Isle of Patmos, when he thus announced himself: "I am he that liveth and was dead, and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen, and have the keys of hell and of death." In answer to Peter's perhaps jealous inquiry respecting John, "And what shall this man do?" Christ seems to have desired

to intimate to him that there should be accorded to the beloved apostle the privilege of surviving until he should come as he did to him *in person*, with special communications to the churches. But it is unnecessary to dwell upon a feature in the Scriptures so well known, and so necessary, indeed to their credibility, since it is the *fulfillment* of a prediction that exhibits the Divine authority and the truthfulness of the prophet who delivered it; and the accomplishment of a promise—the faithfulness of him who gave it. There is, therefore, a strong antecedent probability that John, who records Christ's promise to pray for the Comforter, would also be careful to record its fulfillment. Coming, however, to Christ's prayer itself, as presented to us, we find, both in it and in the attending circumstances, abundant evidence that we have here the fulfillment of Christ's promise. We notice, 1, the singular fact that

*This prayer was offered up in the presence and audience of the disciples.* Private prayer is made in solitude, and, for the purpose of such prayer, Christ often secluded himself from his disciples. Here, however, he prays *in their presence*, yet not *with* them, but *for* them. He uses the first person, and the address is directly from him to the Father in behalf of the "little flock" which surrounded him, and for their successors in the faith. The most probable explanation of this singular fact seems to be that he wished the disciples to know that he fulfilled the promise given, and not only so, but also to learn, from the very manner of its fulfillment, more fully

and impressively, not only the nature of the blessing sought, but the relation which he sustained to the Father, as well as to the disciples themselves. It would be difficult to conceive how they could so well receive in any other way those practical assurances and touching consolations which they so much needed, as in the simple utterances of this wondrous prayer, so comprehensive in its scope, and so far-reaching in its application; so full of gentle affection, filial confidence, and unswerving truth. There is nothing like it anywhere, nor have we in any other portion of Scripture such a revelation of the relation subsisting between the Father and the Son, Christ and his people. But that this prayer is truly and substantially *the* prayer for the Holy Spirit, may be further shown by the fact that—

2. *It is Offered Exclusively for the Disciples.* It is a very remarkable feature in this prayer that Christ says in it, in express terms, "I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me out of the world." At first view it might appear strange that the Savior, at this supreme moment, when about to offer himself as a sacrifice for the sin of the world, should thus except the world from his petitions in this solemn and comprehensive prayer; that he should say, distinctly and publicly, to his Father, "I pray not for the world." But this becomes entirely comprehensible and appropriate when the only explanation the case admits is given, to wit: that the particular blessing for which he then prayed could not be received or enjoyed by the world. Now this blessing could be no other than

the gift of "the Holy Spirit which God gives to them who obey him," and which Christ, just before, had declared the world could not receive. "I will pray the Father," said he, "and he will give you another Comforter . . .; even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world can not receive, because it seeth him not neither knoweth him. But ye know him, for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you." Heretofore he had been *with* them in the person of Christ, *in* whom he dwelt, but the time was at hand when the Holy Spirit should dwell in the disciples also. Heretofore to them the manifestation had been God in the flesh—Christ *with* them; this was soon to be changed into a manifestation of Christ *in* them, by his Spirit. "I will not leave you comfortless,"\* he adds, "I will come to you. . . . At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father and you in me and I in you." Heretofore, "anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power," Christ had "manifested forth his glory" in miracles, wonders, and signs; in precious instructions; in divine revelations both to his disciples and to the world. The time approached when he was to manifest himself differently and exclusively to the disciples. When the question is asked by one of them, "Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us and not unto the world?"

---

\*"Comfortless" is an inadequate rendering of ὀρφανός. "Orphans," given as a marginal reading and adopted by Geo. Campbell is also incorrect. Originally with the ancients it meant *deprived of children*, now it signifies *deprived of parents*. The proper sense of ὀρφανός is *desolate, destitute, deprived of guardianship*.

he replies, "If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." The meaning of this promise is clearly seen from the declaration of Christ—John vii : 38, "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." "But this," adds an *inspired* commentator, "spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive. For the Holy Spirit was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Believers, then, *only* were to receive the Spirit. The unbelieving world (*ἡ κοσμος*) could not participate in this blessing which was to be bestowed only on those whose hearts, 'purified by faith,' (Acts xv : 9) were thus prepared to receive it. It was such individuals as "after believing" were "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise" that were to be "builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit," Eph. i : 13 ; ii : 22. It is here, moreover, explained why the Holy Spirit was not given at the time of Christ's ministry on earth. The reason was that Christ had not yet been "glorified." As he said, "It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come to you, but if I depart I will send him unto you." It was necessary that Christ should "die for our sins," that he should be "raised again for our justification," and be "exalted to the throne of his glory, having obtained eternal redemption for us"—in a word, it was necessary that the work of Christ should thus be finished, before the redeemed could receive that



final manifestation of God in the gift of the Holy Spirit, which was to abide with them forever, and which is not to be mistaken for the "charisms," or special powers which this Spirit communicated to the church for temporary purposes and for a limited time. "The gift of the Holy Spirit" is here the Spirit *himself*, the Paraclete, promised by Christ to all believers and first sent down on the day of Pentecost, after the glorification of Christ. "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted," says Peter, "and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." (Compare Acts ii: 33, 38; x: 44; xi: 15, 16.) The world could see and hear the miraculous power which the Spirit displayed in the confirmation of the testimony both of Christ and his followers, but this "world" could neither "see" nor "know" the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete, the attesting "seal" of true discipleship, the assuring "earnest" of an eternal inheritance. The Spirit of God bore testimony to the messiahship of Jesus in the miracles and mighty works which he and his apostles performed before the world, and the apostles themselves added their own individual testimony. "When the Comforter is come," said Jesus, "whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me. And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning," John xv: 26, 27. Hence Peter says (Acts v: 32), "We are his witnesses of these things, and so is also the Holy Spirit

which God hath given to them that obey him." Thus the world could receive the *testimony* of the Holy Spirit, and the *testimony* of those who were the witnesses of Christ's life, death, resurrection, and ascension, but not "until after that they believed," could any receive that Holy Spirit as an indwelling presence and an abiding earnest of future blessedness. The world could receive "the word," "the gospel," "the truth," and hence the apostles were directed to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," to "make disciples, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit"—the promise being assured to all who would obey the gospel that they should receive the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit, "for," said Peter to the Jews, "the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." \*

---

\* This promise is evidently to all obedient believers in all ages. It is to the *Jews* and to their "children" or descendants—also to those who were "afar off," the *Gentiles*, of whom Christ had said, "other sheep have I who are not of this fold, them also must I bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd," John x: 16. It was to these as to the Jews—to all who would hear the Saviour's *voice*. Peter, in speaking of the conversion of the Gentiles, said: "God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should *hear the gospel and believe*. And God who knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit even as he did unto us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." Both the words here rendered "giving" and "purifying" are, in the original, in the aorist tense, which indicates that which is usually or always true. It was in ful-

It is easy to perceive, then, from these most explicit and unmistakable declarations of Holy-Writ, how it was that Christ, in praying according to his promise that the Father would send the Comforter, could not entreat this blessing for the *world* or *κοσμος*. It is easy to see why he made an express statement that he prayed, not for the world, but for those that God had given him "out of the world." "I have given them thy word," said Jesus, "and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." His prayer,

---

fillment of the regular and established Divine plan or method, that all hearts were to be purified by faith, and that God would give his Holy Spirit to all thus prepared to receive it. This purification occurred only in those who '*heard the gospel and believed.*' "Ye are *clean,*" said Jesus to the disciples, "through the *word* which I have spoken unto you," John xv: 3. So, also, in praying for the Comforter for them, he first states the fact as to his personal followers: "I have given unto them the *words* which thou gavest me, and they have *received* them and have known surely that I came out from thee, and have believed *that thou didst send me.*" Again, the future disciples he characterizes as those who shall believe on him through the apostle's word or gospel, and for such, and such *only*, he entreats that Divine blessing of unity with himself and with the Father which proceeded from the impartation of the Holy Spirit. The promise rehearsed by Peter is thus to "as many as the Lord our God shall call." For as Christ taught, "Every man that hath *heard*, and hath *learned* of the Father, cometh unto me." Thus it was foretold, "They shall all be *taught* of God." It was necessary thus to *hear* and to *learn* of the Father's love in the gospel of his Son, and none could come to Jesus but those who were thus "drawn of the Father"—to whose hearts God had manifested his love in sending his Son to save the world. All such were "called of God," being called by the gospel of his grace.

accordingly, was for that Holy Spirit which the children of God alone were to receive, in harmony with the Divine will, as well as with the nature of that spiritual kingdom now to be established among men, and which was "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit."

It may be objected here, that in this prayer the word Comforter does not occur; that Christ does not, in express terms, pray the Father to send the Holy Spirit to the disciples. He says merely "Holy Father keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are." It is granted that the Holy Spirit is not directly mentioned, and that the petition here is simply and expressly for *ONENESS*, such as existed between Christ himself and the Father. It is to be remembered, however, that prayer for an *end* is, in effect, prayer for the *means* by which that end is to be attained. The *oneness* here spoken of could be effected in no other way than by the presence of the Spirit in believers, and hence a petition for this *oneness* is a prayer for the Holy Spirit, which, as we have seen, had not yet been given, and which alone was now wanting to complete the blessings which the Gospel was designed to impart.

Furthermore, in view of the mysterious unity of the Godhead, it might have been incongruous for Christ in a direct address to the Father, to employ terms and maintain distinctions adapted especially to men's capacities, and to pray, in express terms for the Comforter or Paraclete, especially since the Spirit

could be such only as *in* the disciples and *to* them alone. He could, nevertheless, appropriately pray for the consummation of that spiritual "oneness" which it was the office of the Holy Spirit to establish between the Redeemer and the redeemed. Similarly, even in regard to those manifestations of the Divine nature itself, involved in the plan of redemption, and, by the Saviour, for the first time clearly made known, it is through the pervading presence and oneness of the Spirit that the unity of God reveals itself to human conception. It was not until Jesus was anointed by the Holy Spirit, or formally constituted the Christ, that the heavens were opened and he was publicly announced as "the Son of God." It was then that he entered upon his ministry, and in "the power of the Spirit" fulfilled his mission. In all his teaching, while affirming his own Divine character and Sonship, and that "all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father," he is, at the same time, careful to declare the Divine unity, and that he and the Father are "one." "Believe the works," said he, "that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me and I in him," John x: 38. When Philip urges, "Show us the Father and it sufficeth us," the reply is, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in

me, he doeth the works," John xiv : 9, 10. Not only then, in virtue of his birth through the Spirit, but by the indwelling of that Spirit, did Jesus show forth his glory as the "Word made flesh," dwelling among men "full of grace and truth," and exhibiting in himself that unity with God of which he now prays that his disciples may be made partakers : "Keep, through thine own name," he entreats of the Father, "those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are." That it is this unity which constitutes the principal feature in this remarkable prayer, so far as it relates to the disciples, will be evident upon a careful examination or analysis of the prayer itself, to which the attention of the reader is now invited.

Declaring that the appointed hour had now arrived, he prays in the first instance for his own glorification, in order that he might then, in the further execution of the Divine purposes committed to him, impart to those whom the Father had given him, eternal life. Having thus petitioned for his own exaltation, in view of his having "finished the work" which the Father had given him to do, [an exaltation which was also a necessary preliminary to the sending of the Holy Spirit], he proceeds at once to speak of the disciples, who, he says, had received and kept the words which the Father had given him, and had believed in his Divine mission. Formally excluding the world, he now prays expressly for these alone, entreating that as he himself by whom they had been "kept" was about to leave them in the world, the Father would now keep them through his own name,

“that,” says he, “they may be ONE as we are.” As he was now coming to the Father, he speaks these things while yet “in the world”—while yet with them, in order that the Divine Presence, and that blessed unity which constituted his own joy, might be theirs also. For this he now urges their need, as well as their preparedness. They had received the word of God; they were no longer of “the world,” and were hence exposed to the hatred of the world and the enmity of the Evil One. He does not desire that they should be removed from these trials and dangers, but that they should be “kept” or protected from the Evil One while in the world, in the fulfillment of the mission to which he had appointed them. To this end he prays that they may be sanctified through the truth, the word of God, the gospel, through which the Divine Spirit would enable them to maintain that separation from the world exemplified in Christ himself, who now sent them as his ambassadors to the world, as he had himself been sent of God, and for their sakes had sanctified himself, as a consecrated High Priest, having been “without sin,” holy, harmless, undefiled, and separated from sinners.

Passing now, by an easy transition, to those who should believe on him through the word of these apostles, and anticipating the success of their labors in making converts from the world, he offers for these future disciples precisely the same petition for *unity*—“that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.” The believers of the present, as well as of all future

time, were thus to partake alike of this "oneness" in Christ, and he had, accordingly, already assigned or given to them, in the promise "I will send you another Comforter who shall abide with you forever" [with the church through all successive ages], that "glory" [that Holy Spirit which God had bestowed on him], in order, says he, "that they may be one as we are one," that they may be made perfect in one [in unity], the great end or purpose to be thereby accomplished, on behalf of the world being "that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me." He then closes this most wondrous prayer, which covers all time and reaches into an eternity both past and future, by entreating that all those whom God had given him, should finally be admitted to behold that glorious exaltation which he was to receive in the heavens, "for thou," said he, "lovedst me before the foundation of the world," and though the world knew not God and had rejected Christ, yet these disciples had acknowledged his Divine mission, and to them he had declared and would still declare the name of the Father, in order that his love might be extended to them also — "that the love wherewith thou hast loved me," said he, "may be in them, and" closing with the keynote, he adds, "I in them," that Christ himself might be in his people by his indwelling Spirit, constituting one glorious spiritual body, participating alike in all its members of that everlasting life and blessedness which proceeds through him alone.

It will be evident now, that the leading and en-



grossing thought in this prayer is *unity*; and that it distinctly indicates the means by which this unity was to be attained. It was not to be a "unity," much less a *union*, of disciples alone, in the false sense usually attached to it. It was a unity proceeding from and embracing Christ and the Father. It was to be effected by the presence of Christ in his people, as the Father was present in Christ—"I in them and thou in me, that they may be one in us—that they may be made perfect in (ἐν) one"—in becoming one, for "he that is joined unto the Lord," says Paul, "is one Spirit," 1 Cor. vi: 17. The nature and the source of this unity, then, is plain—Christ dwells in his people by his word and his Spirit. "Ye are not under the flesh, but under the Spirit," says the apostle, "if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his," Rom. viii: 9. "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father," Gal. iv: 6. Thus was realized, during the Apostolic ministry, the declaration of Christ to his disciples, John xiv: 20: "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." For the "day" to which he here refers is the period when he promised to send them "another Paraclete." He had himself, thus far, been their Paraclete, their Helper, their Advocate, their Comforter, but in a little while the world should see him no more. He would not, however, leave the disciples desolate in the world. He would send them another Paraclete—he would even himself come to

them, by his Spirit, to abide with them forever. They should then realize that Divine unity of which he had spoken, as well as the full meaning of his promise, "If a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come and make our abode with him," John xiv: 23. "Hereby know we," says John, "that we dwell in him and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit," 1 John iv: 13. It was hence "expedient" that Christ's personal presence in the flesh should be withdrawn—that the disciples should know him no more "after the flesh," in order that upon the completion of his redemptive work, there might be consummated by the Paraclete that Divine, spiritual, and glorious unity which was the ultimate purpose of the gospel dispensation.

### CHAPTER III.

Christ's Prayer not for "Christian union"—First Disciples already united—Difficulties—Distinction between union and unity—Unity, the "unity of the Spirit"—How maintained and lost—A Divine gift—World not to be converted by union but by unity—This a constant result—The Divine promises.

IT will be seen that the view just given of Christ's prayer (John xvii) is quite different from the one commonly entertained. From the manner in which it is quoted and referred to, it is evident that it is generally considered to be mainly in behalf of what is called "Christian union," and that this "union" is furthermore supposed to be a matter yet in the *future*, so that the prayer, in its chief petition, is thought to have remained heretofore unanswered. It is accordingly expedient to examine this notion more particularly, in order that its incorrectness and superficiality may be fully apparent, and that the actual truth may find access to the mind. For it is the chief hinderance to progress in religious knowledge that error has preoccupied the ground, and that before any thing can be learned, much must be unlearned. The latter, indeed, is by far the more difficult task, since human opinions, theories, and dogmas have so filled the minds of men, that there

is no longer room for truths derived directly from the Scriptures, and it is necessary to overcome that pride of consistency, those prejudices of education and that false reliance upon human authority, by which all approaches are defended, before the Word of God can even claim admittance.

Let us, then, here briefly consider certain difficulties which at once arise upon the supposition that the popular view of this prayer is correct, and that it is mainly on behalf of a visible union among believers. If this be true, it follows that this solemn and special prayer was offered for that of which the first disciples were *already in possession*. It is well known that the personal followers of Christ were *united*, and that they formed one harmonious and unbroken band, in perfect concord with each other. But as prayer is always made for that of which persons are destitute, and these disciples already enjoyed "Christian union," this could not constitute the subject-matter of Christ's petition. Again, as it is related to those 'who should believe on him through their word;' if it be urged that it was in consequence of this prayer that they also formed one religious community and maintained "Christian union," until long after the close of the apostolic ministry, the inquiry may be justly made why this union was not perpetuated? and why this prayer has failed to be answered in the case of those who for sixteen centuries have also believed through the apostles teaching? Christ said on one occasion to the Father: "I know that thou hearest me always." Is it to be supposed that his prayer for

“Christian union” has been unheard and unanswered for sixteen hundred years, and that its fulfillment is yet postponed to some indefinite future period?

But further. We find in this prayer these several petitions. 1. That he himself might be glorified in heaven. 2. That his personal followers might be “kept” so as to be “one” as Christ and the Father were one. 3. That they might be “kept from the Evil One.” 4. That they might be sanctified through the truth. 5. That all future believers should likewise be “one,” and 6. That all who were given to Christ might be with him to behold the glory to which the Father had destined him. It will be admitted that the first petition was granted, and that Christ was glorified “with the glory which he had with the Father before the world was.” The second also, the third and the fourth are conceded as fulfilled in the primitive disciples. Even of the sixth, it may be affirmed that it has been constantly in process of accomplishment, since all the saints who have fallen asleep have departed “to be with Christ;” but if in its full sense deferred, it is simply because the time appointed for the resurrection and glorification of the saints has not yet arrived. Now these things being so, on what principle of interpretation or of consistency can it be maintained that the fifth petition, viz., that believers through the apostles’ word might be “one,” has remained unanswered during nearly all the Christian centuries, and is still to be unheard until some indefinite time in the dim and distant future? When the other petitions are evi-

dently granted, why is this particular one to be singled out as yet unheard, when its purport is really the same as that of the second, and the blessing for which it pleads was certainly just as much needed by the disciples of the future, as that of the second was by those then present? The petition in each case was for "oneness." If this be merely union, can any good reason be assigned why it should be granted to the primitive disciples and denied to those who, through the intervening centuries, have believed on Christ through the word of the apostles? And can it be supposed that any sort of ecclesiastical, visible, or sentimental union to be effected in the future between the numerous bodies professing Christianity can be at all the realization of the petition, "I in them and thou in me, that they may be one in us?" It is indeed surprising that so palpable an error, arising probably from the textuary system of interpretation, should so long have remained undetected, and that the profound significance of our Lord's prayer for unity should be even yet hidden from the religious world, by the superficial theological figment that his petition was for a matter so inferior and subordinate as a "Christian union" among his people, to be visibly attained by some future combination or conglomeration of religious parties!

The prayer of Christ, let it be observed, was neither in form nor in substance a prayer for *union*, but for *oneness*. These are two different words and stand for two different things. They do not contain each other in their respective significations, neither

do they imply each other, for we may have union without unity and even unity without union. Union is the mere joining together of two or more bodies in one. It implies a combination that is manifest or may be made manifest, but unity denotes an invisible oneness; so that there may be a visible union, but not a visible unity. Union involves neither similarity of structure nor identity of nature, for the most anomalous and incongruous materials may be joined or mingled, and the most opposite things may be united, as, for instance, in man, the flesh and the spirit which are "contrary the one to the other." But "oneness" supposes, so far as it extends, homogeneity, similarity, congruity, singleness, a common pervading principle or nature, or a mutual adaptation and arrangement of parts for some special and common purpose. Mere union, hence, does not establish unity, nor does unity imply union. Gold is one thing, and maintains its oneness, however minute the particles into which it may be divided. It is not one, because all gold is or may be fused into one mass, but because the properties of each particle are similar. It is thus that in a religious point of view, unity implies a common nature or joint relation, arising from a joint participation of the Holy Spirit, imparting to each individual similar dispositions, feelings, and purposes. Mere union may arise from very dissimilar causes. An individual may unite with a church on account of some agreement in opinion, or from motives of convenience or of policy. Churches may unite with each other for

the sake of popularity or power, but such unions have nothing to do with unity either as a cause or as a consequence. On the other hand, unity may exist, while visible union either congregational or denominational may be wholly absent, on account of distance, difference of language and other circumstances. Visible union, in short, is never to be mistaken for that spiritual unity which by the tie of a common birth from above, a heavenly parentage, a common nature, necessarily establishes a oneness which, while it exists quite independently of external or visible union, nevertheless fails not to secure this, whenever intervening obstacles are removed and natural attractions and affinities are permitted to exert their power. Union will hence inevitably follow where Christians dwell together in any particular locality, and union among Christians is certainly enjoined in Scripture. "I beseech you," says Paul to the Corinthians, "that ye all speak the same thing and that there be no divisions among you." In deprecating division, the apostle urges union, and believers who are "taught of God to love one another" will naturally be drawn together into visible associations, and the more especially, since religious ordinances as well as the duties which they owe to each other demand organization, co-operation, and public assemblies. Such things, however, are so far from constituting Christian unity or producing it, that they are merely results of that oneness with Christ and with the Father for which the Saviour prayed, and which, as a differential attribute of the individual



Christian, can alone render true Christian union possible.

Christian unity is expressly designated by the apostle as "the unity of the Spirit," Eph. iv: 3; "that is the unity wrought by the Spirit, τοῦ Πνεύματος, being the genitive of the originating cause," (Ellicott *in loco*). In further illustration, Paul goes on to enumerate various points in which the existence of this "unity of the Spirit" might be recognized, as in the admitted fact that there was but "one body"—the whole community of Christians, and one Spirit which pervaded that body; that all believers had been called in relation to "one hope," and that there was, moreover, "one Lord" acknowledged; "one faith" professed; "one baptism" received, which, in the case of each individual, was into the name of the three Divine manifestations, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; "one God, the Father of all," who is "above all," and, by the indwelling Spirit, "*through all and in all*," it being by this essential means, to which the apostle thus finally recurs, that "unity" or "oneness" was established and maintained. It was the same Spirit, working in all, producing similar fruits of obedience in all, imparting to all the same Divine nature, creating in all similar fears and hopes, similar antipathies and sympathies, similar joys and sorrows; developing in all the same qualities and attributes of character, and constituting of the followers of Christ a "living epistle" to the world, which might be "known and read of all men," and which was "written, not with ink, but with the

Spirit of the Living God ; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart."

This "unity of the Spirit," it may be here further observed, was to be kept "in the bond of peace," nothing being more unfavorable to it than those contentions, divisions, "wars, and fightings," which proceed from the carnal nature, and which, alienating men from each other, alienate them also from God, so that, in an equal measure, they cease to enjoy that spiritual fellowship and oneness with the Father and the Son which was the burden of our Saviour's prayer. "Peace" is here beautifully represented as the bond, the cincture *by* which, or, as some think, the element *in* which, unity is to be maintained. So essential is it to this end, that it is frequently and earnestly enjoined in Scripture. "Live in peace, and the God of peace shall be with you," says Paul to the Corinthians. "Be at peace among yourselves," he entreats the Thessalonians. "Have salt in yourselves," said Christ to the disciples, "and have peace one with another." Peace, as intimately connected with purity (James iii : 17), is that state which is particularly conducive to the preservation of unity, and it is the one, therefore, which, in reference to this end, is especially to be cultivated. Whatever disturbs harmony among Christians, tends to destroy Christian unity. The bitter controversies and the bickerings of religious society, distract the mind, destroy love, generate dislike, jealousy, revenge, foster the passions of the carnal nature, and tend to quench the "light of life." It is possible for men thus to lose that Divine gift

which alone gives unity, to "grieve the Holy Spirit" so that he will abandon his ungenial abode and leave the heart a prey to infidelity and worldly lusts.

Men have it, hence, in their power to preserve or to destroy unity, but not to *impart* it. They may establish *union*, but not unity. Nothing, then, can be more incorrect than to mistake this prayer, as is constantly done, for a mere prayer for union. Nay, it is often quoted as if really addressed to Christians and as if it were an injunction to them to be united. It is said "Christians are commanded to be one." No, never. This were indeed an impossible obedience. They are commanded to live in peace as a condition of the continuance of the Divine presence: to be of "one accord and one mind;" to "stand fast in one Spirit," etc. All this it is in their power to do. They can be "at peace" among themselves, they can "live in peace," but it is not in their power to establish *unity*. This is the office of the Holy Spirit, and as God alone can give the Holy Spirit, Christ addresses his prayer to the Father that this unity may be so effected. He does not pray that the disciples might be induced to form a union with each other or with himself. This union already existed. He prays for that of which they were yet destitute, and which no mere union could supply—the "unity" of the Spirit—the "communion of the Holy Spirit," which they were afterward enjoined to preserve by "the bond of peace," and warned not to impair by contention and strife. While union, then, can never *originate* or *constitute* Christian unity, partyism and

dissension can do much to destroy it, for "where envy and strife is there is confusion and every evil work," incompatible with the spiritual presence of "the God of peace." We need not wonder, accordingly, at the earnestness of the apostles in entreating the disciples that there should be no divisions among them, but that they should be "perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment," that there might be no schism in the body of Christ. "I beseech you," says Paul to the Romans, "mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ but their own belly, and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

It is the expected result of the "oneness" for which Christ prayed, that the "world" would believe that the Father had sent him. They who imagine this "oneness" to be union, plead accordingly for Christian union on this ground, that it will result in the conversion of the world to Christianity. In this also, it is evident, they wholly misconceive the purpose of this prayer, and greatly err in attributing so grand and important an effect to a cause altogether inadequate. It is not indeed surprising that the pious, deploring the existing divisions of religious society, and mourning over the strife, the infidelity, and the waste of resources which these occasion, should have been led to exaggerate the value of mere union, and that they have become impressed with the

idea that the healing of these divisions is all that is necessary to the triumph of the gospel. It is hence natural for them to adopt the superficial view that in Christ's prayer "Christian union" is designated as the means through which the world is ultimately to be convinced that the Father has sent him as a Saviour. It is a great mistake, however, to suppose that mere "union" could accomplish such a result, or that this result itself is a matter yet altogether in the future. It is *unity* alone which can effect this hereafter, as it is this alone which has accomplished it in the past, and it is therefore for unity that our Saviour prays: "That they may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." This is not an adjustment of differences, a *κατάρτισις*; or a joining together, a mere *κόλλησις*; but a *ἐνότης*, a *unity or oneness*, which could be attained only by a joint participation of the Spirit, and forfeited only by his departure.

If mere union and co-operation on the part of God's people could accomplish so great a matter as the universal spread of the gospel—the conversion of the entire world, this should have taken place at once in primitive times. For, as before intimated, the disciples were then united. They were Christ's "little flock," his "disciples," his "little children," his "friends"—they followed him, they were gathered together around him, they constituted the entire body of believers in the world, and continued, after Christ's death, to assemble themselves together, so that when the eventful day of Pentecost was fully

come, "they were all with one accord in one place." Here was union, but as yet not unity, for the "day" had now only just arrived when they were to know that Christ was in the Father, that they were in Christ, and Christ in them, through the fulfillment of his promise, "I will not leave you bereft, I will come to you," even in that "Spirit of Truth," which, said he, "shall be in you," John xiv: 17-20.

While waiting for this promise, the mere union of these believers had apparently no influence in inducing men to believe in the mission of Christ. There seems to have been no effort for such a purpose. A belief in the gospel facts—in Christ *for* them, was not enough to inaugurate the ministry of the apostles. The purification of the heart by faith was but a preparation for the reception of the Holy Spirit, which, as Christ *in* them, imparted unity, and "power from on high." It was then that they were enabled to speak the word with boldness, to brave the threatenings and persecutions of their enemies, and "in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in strifes, in imprisonments, in their lives, and in their deaths, to manifest the power of Christianity. It was "by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Spirit, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God," and by "the armor of righteousness," that the primitive Christians spread the gospel through the ancient world, succeeded in overcoming idolatry and Judaism, and in inducing, at length, imperial Rome to profess faith in the mission of Jesus of Nazareth. Christ's peti-

tion had been heard. That oneness with God and Christ for which the Saviour prayed, had been granted. The church was "a habitation of God through the Spirit," and each member exhibiting "the fruits of the Spirit" in his daily life, the world, so far as it was impressed at all, became assured of Christ's Messiahship. Thus, from the day of Pentecost, from "that day" in which the disciples realized, in the joint participation of the Holy Spirit, that Christ was *in* them, the world began to believe that the Father had sent the Son to be the Saviour of men, and from that time to the present, just in proportion as the "fruits of the Spirit" have been manifested in the lives of Christians, in the same proportion has "the world" believed in Christianity.

It is an entire mistake, accordingly, to suppose that the prayer of Christ has reference to any union of believers, to any conglomeration of sects, or any species of religious alliance, yet future, or that the belief in his mission which is referred to as certainly to be produced by the "oneness" spoken of, is a matter still in the future. Yet it is precisely this error under which religious society now labors, and which is constantly reiterated in sermons, in pleas and prayers for Christian union, in printed essays, tracts, and volumes. It is surprising how generally this superficial and false view of the prayer of Christ prevails, and what vain expectations are entertained of both the possibility and the efficacy of a general or universal religious and ecclesiastical "union" among believers. It is only as they individually possess one-

ness with Christ, and exhibit that oneness in a holy life, and in unceasing efforts for the salvation of men, that the "world" will be converted—a result which has been in progress from the day of Pentecost until now, and which will, in like manner, continue to be accomplished in the future. For the "world" is here spoken of *distributively*, and it was as true in the days of Paul that Christ was "believed on in the world," as it was that he was "preached unto the Gentiles," or that he had been "received up into glory." \*

---

\* That I have not misstated or exaggerated the prevailing, if not universal, error in relation to the portion of Scripture here considered, will be apparent to all who are familiar with the language of the constantly reiterated plea for Christian union. It is this passage that is the inevitable quotation *always*. It is in most cases the *only* passage referred to, as if the subject of Christian union was nowhere else spoken of in the New Testament, or as if the language here was more authoritative or clear and cogent than elsewhere. Furthermore, it always receives an application to the *future*, it being constantly taken for granted that the "union" wished for has not yet occurred. Universally, it is the *per contra* to the existing divisions in the religious world, and is applied to some hoped for organic union yet to come, while the profound meaning of the passage and its perfect applicability *to all ages of the church* remain wholly overlooked. Christ's prayer that his people might be one with himself and the Father *was* answered, and *has continued to be answered* in every age since it was offered. True believers have always and every-where been "one," in the true sense of the expression—a sense infinitely superior to the superficial interpretation put upon it when it is regarded as relating to an organic, visible union. In the nature of things, a universal union of this kind is impossible. The conditions of humanity utterly preclude the possibility of any denominational or organic *union* among believers in this wide world, but the *unity* for which Christ



Another illustration of the difference between union and unity, as well as of the meaning of Christ's language in the prayer under consideration, may be found in the beautiful similitude which he used in his preliminary discourse to his disciples. "I am the vine," said he, "ye are the branches ; he that abideth

---

prayed is always, and has been always, not only possible but existent. It is the "communion of saints"—the "communion of the Holy Spirit," the "benediction" so often pronounced in Christian assemblies without any proper conception of its meaning.

Let me not be misunderstood as objecting to prayer for Christian union. This, so far as it is attainable, is most desirable, and every effort should be made to break down the bigotry of denominationalism and the rancor of party spirit, and to bring the entire Christian community into an earnest co-operation in good works. Neither is it to be understood that it is now improper to offer Christ's prayer for unity, and to ask that believers may be "one." This, truly, is a prayer greatly needed ; but let it be distinctly understood that this is a *prayer for the Holy Spirit*, and let it not be perverted and misapplied to so inferior a matter, and one so improbable, if not impossible, as a future universal, organic, Christian *union*.

It is undoubtedly true that existing divisions stand directly in the way of the Christian unity desired ; for it is not to be expected that God will bestow his Holy Spirit upon those who are filled with the spirit of party, and whose energies are devoted to schemes of party aggrandizement and ambition. The reformation hence needed is the *overthrow of denominationalism*, the emptying of the heart of the existing senseless and blind attachment to party names and party interests, in order that the true Spirit of the Gospel may be received. The envy and strife which have produced "confusion and every evil work," must be cast out, in order that the religious community may be prepared to receive the truth in its primitive simplicity, and to enjoy the presence and influence of the Comforter, who is "the Spirit of the Truth." Union and co-operation will doubtless follow, so far as circumstances admit, and "peace" will promote and perpetuate that "unity of the Spirit," which sectarianism has labored to destroy.

in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit, for without me ye can do nothing," John xv: 5. It was the vital unity of the branches with the vine, the abiding of the branches in the vine and the vine in them in all its mysterious life-giving power, that could alone insure the production of fruit. No intertwinning or union *between the branches themselves* could accomplish this, or secure to them that life which proceeded only from the vine. "Abide in me," said Christ, therefore, "and I in you; as the branch can not bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me." In order to this "abiding," it was requisite that Christ's "words" should abide in the disciples, and that they should obey his teachings. "If ye keep my commandments," said he, "ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love." The already existing unity between Christ and the Father was thus to be extended to the disciples. "If a man love me," said he again, "he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." They received the Spirit when this promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, and by a continued obedience to the "words" of Christ enjoyed continually "the supply" of that Spirit, in order that they might produce fruit, through this abiding oneness. Hence, in the letter to the Philippians, chap. i, Paul expresses the earnest hope that through their prayer, and "the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ," the circumstances to which he re-

fers in verses 15 and 16, shall turn to his salvation, according to his earnest expectation and hope that he would in nothing be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so then, Christ might be magnified in his body whether it should be by life or by death. The conditions above specified are plainly accordant with what Christ said to the disciples, John xiv: 15-23: "If ye love me keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father, and he will send you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world can not receive."

It is worthy of special remark here that in the prayer of Christ the disciples are declared to possess the preparation needed for this gift. He had previously said to them, "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you," and in his prayer to the Father, he says: "I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me." The means of preparation had been faith in the word of Christ, the belief in the great truth that Jesus was the Messiah—the Son of God; under the influence of which they had been obedient, had forsaken all and followed Christ. Having their hearts thus purified by faith, they were ready to receive that Divine presence which was to abide with them forever. This promise, then, though conditional, faith and obedience being necessary prerequisites, was not, as some falsely think, a change in their own "dispo-

sitions," a mere logical or natural result of "words," a necessary consequence of obedience. The disciples possessed all these, as well as union with each other, yet they remained still destitute of that "oneness" for which Christ earnestly prayed. Christ was not yet in them, as the Father was in Christ, nor were they yet "one," as were the Father and the Son, through an "eternal Spirit." As yet they were merely prepared for this Divine gift in ceasing to be "of the world," since no one who was of the world, that is an unbeliever, could receive it. Christ says of them, in his petition, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." In receiving the word of Christ they had ceased to be of the world, and the world hated them on this account. It was impossible, therefore, that the world could jointly participate with them in that "oneness" imparted by the Spirit. That which is pure must be received into a pure vessel. The Holy Spirit could not take up his abode in an unholy heart. Hence the import of Christ's saying: "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." They had been thus, by the sanctifying power of the truth, prepared for the reception of the Holy Spirit. They had been in heart separated from that world whose friendship was "enmity against God." Paul, accordingly, thus quotes to the Corinthians, at a later period, the spirit of the promise: "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean, and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and

daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." "What concord," he had asked, "hath Christ with Belial, or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." "Having, therefore, these promises," adds the apostle, "let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God," 2 Cor. vi: 16, 18; vii: 1. It is here also that may be quoted a parallel passage from another apostle, where, in connection with "the things pertaining to life and godliness," these "great and precious promises" are referred to as given "that you might be partakers of the Divine nature, having escaped the corruptions that are in the world through lust," 2 Peter i: 4.

And oh, how great and how precious are these promises! How incomprehensible the love, mercy, and condescension of God, thus to make his abode in human hearts! How mysterious the "communion of the Holy Spirit," his impartation of strength to the inner man, his intercession for the saints! How great, amid the toils and conflicts of life, the blessedness of that reign of heaven within the soul which is "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit!" How vain the pleasures of sense, the glories and ambitions of the world, compared with "the things which God has prepared for them that love him!" "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us

all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" And among these, is that "renewing of the Holy Spirit" which he shed on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his grace we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." It is this spiritual presence which imparts and maintains unity with Christ, and brings forth in the Christian the fruits by which God is glorified, so that while on the one hand "the fullness (*πλήρωμα*) of the Godhead bodily" dwells in Christ, on the other, it is the church which, as complete in Christ, becomes "the fullness (the *πλήρωμα*) of him that filleth all in all."

## CHAPTER IV.

Objections of Materialists—Matter and spirit differ in nature—Original facts undemonstrable—Demoniac possessions—Satanic power—The indwelling of the Spirit—Distinguishable from an incarnation—From the Divine omnipresence—The term Guest inappropriate—The Spirit not to be confounded with the word.

THERE are not a few materialists and skeptics of the sensuistic school, and some who even profess a form of Christianity, who doubt or deny the possibility and reality of the gift of the Holy Spirit. With these reasoners, every thing must be subordinated to the forms of the mere logician, and they refuse credence to any thing which they are unable to verify by sensible perception or to comprehend by feeble reason. How, they ask, can the Divine Spirit dwell literally in human beings? How can he be present at the same time in each member of the church? Or, if really present, why is not this presence realized in sensible evidences or in miraculous powers as claimed for the early ages of the church?

As spiritual blessings come through *faith* and not by human philosophy, natural, intellectual, or moral, it were useless to enter upon any serious discussion with objectors whose narrow premises admit only a

certain class of facts, and who willfully close "the eyes of their understanding" against every ray of light which emanates from the spiritual system. These materialists, in their gross conceptions, fail to make just discriminations, and leave altogether out of view the essential fact that spirit is quite different from body, and not subject to the laws which govern material things. "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have," said Jesus. A spirit must hence be conceived of as an intelligent entity or being, wholly distinct from material organization, and, though capable of association or connection with such an organization, just as capable of separation from it, having in itself a nature, different, independent, and peculiar. So very different, indeed, is this nature, that while *spirit* may and does readily connect itself with that which is material, and dwell in the realm of nature, it is impossible for *flesh and blood* to inherit the kingdom of God. The material frame can not dwell within the realm of the spiritual kingdom, but must be raised a "*spiritual* body," or *changed* at the sound of the last trump into that which is altogether different, and alone fitted for the realms of light. How absurd, then, it is for men to apply to spirit those ideas of space and time, and those qualities of things with which they have become acquainted through sensible perception! How presumptuous to decide dogmatically what may be, or what may not be, within the natural capacity of a spiritual being of which so little can now be known! How mysterious and incomprehensible the mode in



which the human spirit dwells in the body, imparting to it harmony, unity, and power, and not only controlling its own material abode, but possessing also the wondrous power of self-superintendence; yet itself, meanwhile, wholly secure from all sensible observation and revealing itself only in its workings! Nay, how impossible it would be for materialistic objectors to furnish a clear exposition of the nature even of *matter*, apart from its properties! How utterly unable would they be to give an explanation or cognition of the essential nature of matter, such as they absurdly ask in regard to spirit!\* Socinian rationalists and skeptical sciolists have yet to learn that the original facts in regard to matter as well as in relation to spirit must be taken *upon trust*, and that they are both, in the widest sense, to be recognized as *revelations*. Wonderful and vast as are the powers conferred on man, it becomes him, at a certain stage of his investigations, to confess himself an ignorant and a finite being, and to repose in humility

---

\*“Every *how* (ὅτι),” well remarks Sir William Hamilton, “rests ultimately upon a *that* (ὅτι); every demonstration is deduced from something *given* and *undemonstrable*; all that is comprehensible hangs upon some *revealed fact* which we *must believe* as *actual*, but *can not construe to the reflective intellect in its possibility*. In consciousness,—in the original spontaneity of intelligence (νοῦς, locus principiorum), are revealed the primordial facts of our intelligent nature. Consciousness is the fountain of all comprehensibility and illustration; but *as such*, can not be itself illustrated or comprehended. To ask how any fact of consciousness is possible, is to ask, how consciousness itself is possible; and to ask how consciousness is possible, is to ask how a being intelligent like man is possible.”

and reverence upon the truths made known to him, through various channels, by the Infinite Intelligence.

It is, certainly, not without a design to afford to "men in the flesh," a certain degree of enlightenment as to the capacities and habitudes of spiritual beings, that the Bible presents to us, as no other volume does, detailed accounts of the doings of supernatural visitants. Especially, is the record of those demoniacal possessions which were permitted at the introduction of Christianity, calculated to reveal the wondrous facility possessed by spiritual beings to enter into and take possession of animal bodies. There is not, indeed, the slightest hint of any difficulty or obstruction here, unless what arises from the inhibition of Divine power, or, in man, from the resistance of the will. The unclean spirit could say, "I will return to my house." He could take with him seven other spirits, and all could enter in and dwell there. Seven demons could dwell together in Mary Magdalen, and a legion of them in another individual, from whom Christ elicited that remarkable reply, (both elicited and recorded for special reasons,) "*My* name is Legion, for *we* are many." How utterly incapable here seems to be the grammatical language of earth, how futile human logic or science, to convey any comprehensible ideas of the real nature and mysterious powers of the inhabitants of the spirit-world! What a strange petition and singular permission to enter into the herd of swine! What a clear and omnipotent Divine command to the dumb

and deaf spirit: "I charge thee come out of him and enter no more into him!"\* What evident possibilities of spiritual inhabitation do these facts unfold, and how constantly is man's susceptibility to unseen spiritual agency manifested in every age by the Satanic influences operating upon human hearts, in evil thoughts suggested, unholy passions awakened, or motives perverted and debased! He who sought to have the primitive disciples in his power that he "might sift them as wheat;" he who entered into Judas to nerve him for the betrayal of the innocent; he who put it into the hearts of Ananias and Sapphira to lie to the Holy Spirit, still knows how to maintain his control over the children of disobedience, and is

---

\* Mark ix. 25. Some of our materialistic doctors who affect great reverence for "the word," while denying its plainest teachings, ought certainly to furnish a proper explanation of these curious facts, fortified by arguments of extreme *solidity*. The case of Ahab's 400 prophets all inspired by one lying spirit would seem to show the diffusibility of spiritual natures, but they may perhaps endeavor to prove it merely an instance of the extreme *moral* extensibility which appertains to mendacity. As a sort of preliminary to their profound investigations into the Etiology and special Pathology of demoniacal indwellings, it might not be inappropriate for them to explain the singular fact with which they must be familiar in physics, that *one* gas acts as a *vacuum* to *another*, so that when a given space is already occupied by one, others may be diffused in the same space, each in as great a quantity, as if that space were wholly unoccupied. It would probably be well for these materialistic philosophers to direct their attention to this physical fact, before they attempt the elucidation of the higher problems of the spiritual system. Indeed one would think it difficult to find a subject better adapted to the genius of these wordy philosophers than the diffusion and especially the *effusion* of gases.

never more successful than when he can persuade them that he has himself no real existence. It is in view, indeed, of the most obvious facts of human experience, that man should tremble at his feebleness and earnestly seek, amidst the perils which surround him from unseen spiritual foes, the countervailing aid of that Divine Presence which 'strengthens with might the inner man' and sustains the soul against the power of the Enemy. Happy the wise and thoughtful ones, who, realizing how little man can know of that mysterious world into which he shall one day enter, and of the real nature of the difficulties and snares which beset his earthly pathway, cherish the more the precious revelations afforded them by an infallible Teacher, and rest in humble faith upon the Divine promises!

It is surprising, indeed, that intelligent persons should have any difficulty in fully accepting the Scripture teaching in regard to spiritual indwelling. The association of a spirit with a material organization is one of the most familiar facts in nature. We see it verified every-where around us. Each one experiences it in himself. It is strange that the doctrine of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the believer should, nevertheless, at once excite ideas of wonder, of miracle, or of some sensuous impression or manifestation. What evidence is there to show that such an indwelling is not perfectly harmonious with all we know of the relations established between matter and spirit? How naturally and gently, so to speak, does the human spirit dwell in the body! Diverse

as body and spirit are in nature, how sweetly are they blended into one being, acting and reacting upon each other in a pleasing companionship! How quickly and with what facility does the human spirit resume its functions when these are temporarily suspended by repose, accident or disease! How perfect its control over the bodily mechanism to a certain extent, and yet how strictly it observes those boundaries which separate its realm from that of the mere organic life! Again, self-poised and independent, how it contemplates calmly its own nature and that of its abode, and pursues its own cogitations as though wholly disconnected with any material organization! In these cases, indeed, we see but its capacity to inhabit and to exert its powers *in* such an organization, so far as vital laws permit, but even when separated, the possibility of its return is shown, as in the case of Jairus' daughter when, at the command of Jesus, "her spirit came again," or in that of Lazarus when, after a four days absence, it at once regained its powers. Nothing, indeed, attributed in Scripture to that mysterious nature—the human soul, over which men can exert no power though they may kill the body, can be at all regarded as *contrary* to human experience, however far the revelations may advance beyond the region within which human science is confined, and no one has a right to deprive these revelations of their meaning and force, in order to reduce them to a level with human ignorance. However mysterious and inscrutable the facts presented to us upon this subject, one conclusion at

least may safely be drawn, that if the human spirit and malignant spirits may, with such facility, enter and re-enter into the human organism, and there exert their influence and control, certainly there is no room for doubt but that the Good Spirit of God can find a ready access to the hearts of his people.

We may not affirm, however, that the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the believer, does not differ in various respects from that of the human spirit in the human body. It is true that the latter is represented as a "tabernacle" in which the soul or immaterial principle resides, or as a "vesture" with which it is clothed, but these metaphors do not express the whole of the literal fact or exhibit that actual *union*, that natural and connate interdependence and affiliation which exist between soul and body, as God has of them constituted one sentient and rational being. On the other hand, the body is termed the temple of the Holy Spirit, and his presence is expressed by various terms signifying to "remain," to "inhabit," to "dwell." He is imparted, however, as a gift, superadded to the natural and ordinary spiritual nature of man, as a Divine Helper and present Intercessor. There is not here *union*, as in the case of the body and the human spirit, but *communion*. There is not constraint, but freedom. There is not an alliance, absolute and necessary, but relative and contingent.

The indwelling of the Spirit is hence to be distinguished from an *incarnation* or manifestation of God in the flesh, such as existed in the person of

Jesus of Nazareth. Here the entire and perfect human nature, consisting of body, soul, and spirit, became united with the Divine nature, constituting one person, perfect both as to his humanity and his Divinity—one with man as the Son of man, and one with the Father as the Son of God. The “Word that was in the beginning with God and that was God” was here “made flesh,” and was found “in fashion as a man.” This was the second man created such by an immediate exercise of Divine power. The first was formed directly from the earth; the second was “made of a woman,” as to his humanity, but as to his Divine nature, was “the Lord from heaven.” In the first creation, woman was taken out of man; in the second, man, by direct Divine power, from woman. That which had been last was made first, and the first, last. “A virgin shall conceive and bear a son,” said the Prophet, “and thou shalt call his name Immanuel.” Here the Divine and human natures were united. In the first Adam, the Divine image was impressed upon humanity; in the second, the human nature was added to the Divine. In the first, that which was earthly and human, became chief and distinctive; in the second, that which was Divine predominated, for “in Him dwelt all the fullness of the godhead bodily”—in bodily form. This mysterious union of humanity with Deity was complete in Jesus *before* he received the gift of the Holy Spirit at his baptism. It was as the Son of God that he received this gift, just as believers become, in regeneration, the adopted chil-

dren of God, and receive afterward the gift of the Holy Spirit. "Because ye are sons," says Paul to the Galatians, "God hath sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts," iv : 6. The gift or indwelling of the Holy Spirit is hence quite different and distinguishable from any *union* of the human and Divine natures, whether this be actual or potential, absolute or relative. The Word was made flesh, and, in an analogy sufficiently obvious, we are told that God begets his children "by the word of truth"—by that word which is "Spirit and life," that "incorruptible seed of the word, which liveth and abideth forever," and which, received into the heart, becomes, as it were, clothed with that humanity through which it manifests itself. It is *after* individuals become, through faith, the adopted children of God, and *because* they "are sons," that God sends "the Spirit of his Son" into their hearts whereby they are enabled fully to realize this relationship, and, in filial love, to cry, "Abba, Father." Hence Paul says to the Romans, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God," viii : 16.

This indwelling of the Spirit, again, is to be distinguished from what is called the "omnipresence" of God. In a certain sense, the presence of the Infinite One is every-where. "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?" asks the Psalmist, "or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there." Ps. clxxxix : 7, 8. As Cre-



ator, Upholder, and Preserver of all things, he pervades the universe, and "in him we live and move and have our being." In this sense, he is equally present with all beings good and evil, with matter and spirit, with things animate and inanimate; sustaining all, maintaining the order of nature, exercising supervision and government over all. Here he may be conceived as present with, and in, the organism of nature, and, in a special sense, he may be also regarded as present every-where by his Providence, in which he so directs the operations of nature as to supply special wants or to accomplish the purposes of moral government. The elements of material nature, or its secret forces, he may cause to form the malaria of disease or the contagion of the pestilence. The stormy wind, the waves of the sea, the flames of fire, may become his ministers and fulfill his commands. "The young lions do roar and seek their meat from God." "He watereth the hills from his chambers." "He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle and herb for the service of man, that he may bring good out of the earth." What he gives, they gather. When he opens his hand, they are "filled with good;" when he hides his face, "they are troubled." All *living* things wait upon him, that he may "give them their meat in due season." Without him, not a sparrow falleth to the ground, and he guideth the affairs of men and nations so that his purposes are accomplished in their punishment or their deliverance, and he becomes the avenger of the injured and "the Savior of all men,"

through the innumerable instrumentalities ever at his disposal.

All this, however, is quite distinct from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It was in a special and peculiar sense that Jesus said of the man who would keep his words: "My Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." It was as a distinct manifestation of God, that the Paraclete was imparted to believers. It was the Holy Spirit who now came to dwell on earth in human hearts as a Divine and confirmatory seal of faith, and an earnest or pledge *in kind* of that spiritual inheritance which was to be the eternal possession of the righteous. It was Christ *in* men, bringing forth in them the fruitage of goodness, righteousness and truth, exhibiting the glory of the Divine character and securing for them an everlasting blessedness. It was a gift—a manifestation of the Divine presence, peculiar to the gospel dispensation, confined entirely to believers, and specially appertaining to that final and complete development of the mysteries of redemption which the gospel alone presents. It is hence to be distinguished, also, from that special presence of God recognized in miracles. These were common to all dispensations, revealing God in his power as Creator and Ruler, or in his wisdom as Counselor, Instructor, and prescient Monitor, accomplishing their purposes, equally through agencies rational or irrational, sentient or unconscious. But the Paraclete—the Holy Spirit of the Christian Institution—is God's missionary to men's hearts; it is

God enthroned in man's *moral* nature, renewing and sanctifying the affections, and transforming humanity into the Divine image by the graces it imparts and through the "engrafted word" which it has introduced into the heart, and now ever preserves green in the memory and fruitful in the life.

Before leaving the particular subject of the present chapter, it may be well to add a few words in relation to the propriety of the term "Guest," which some employ in relation to the Holy Spirit as dwelling in the believer. Christ says, (Rev. iii: 20,) "I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him and will sup with him." This, if taken as referring to the Spirit, certainly suggests the idea of a guest. What immediately follows, however, "and he shall sup with me," reverses this, and presents him in the capacity of a host. Upon the whole, while, in a certain point of view, the term "Guest" might be allowable, it is not well to employ a word never so used in Scripture, and one which indicates a relation merely casual and transitory. This, as respects the Spirit and the believer, would not be accordant with fact, since his sojourn is permanent—"he shall abide with you forever"—a constant Guardian, Helper and Guide. It is the obsolescence of the word "Ghost" in the common version, which has evidently given rise to the substitution of "Guest." "Ghost" was a proper representative of *πνεῦμα* when the common version was made. Since then, however, this word has, in common use, been restricted to one of the meanings

which it has in common with *πνεῦμα*, viz., to a supposed apparition of a deceased person, and the expression tends to convey a wrong idea to the minds of the uninstructed. Some have hence fallen into the habit of substituting "Guest" for "Ghost" as if it were an equivalent. But this is far from correct. "Guest" is from the Saxon *gæst* or *gest*, a *guest*, a *man*, a *human being*, being allied to the verb *gan*, *gangan* (whence the Scottish *ganga*) *to go*. "Ghost," on the other hand, is from *gast*, the *breath*, a *spirit* etc., (whence the English *gas*, etc.), and though it be true that both these words may have probably the same radical sense, viz., *to go*, *to move*, *to rush*, they had nevertheless, at the period when the common version was made, acquired quite independent and different meanings, so that, of the two, "Ghost" alone was then a proper representative of the Greek *πνεῦμα*, now correctly rendered Spirit in modern English.

It may be proper to notice here also, a much more common error, where the indwelling of the Spirit is confounded with that of the word. Because Christ says of his words in a peculiar sense, as to their import and the results which proceed from them, that they are "spirit and life," and Paul exhorts Christians to let "the word of Christ dwell in them richly," some have hastily adopted the conclusion that the indwelling of the Spirit is nothing more than the presence of the word in the mind or memory. These philosophers go on accordingly to attribute the entire results of Christianity, as evolved in the life, to the natural influence of "words and arguments" ad-

dressed to the intellect. They do not believe in any actual impartation of the Spirit as such, but the New Testament is with them tantamount to "the gift of the Holy Spirit." This view prevailed at one time to a considerable extent in the Church of England, both Bishop Heber and Bishop Warburton having entertained it, as well as a large number of the inferior clergy.\* Stillingfleet, too, held with those just mentioned, that the promise of the Holy Spirit was fulfilled in the extraordinary gifts of the apostolic age, and that the New Testament, containing the result of these in the development and confirmation of the gospel, has been, since that period, equivalent to the presence of the Spirit. Unitarians, Socinians and Pelagians take substantially the same ground, though differing as to the inspiration of the Sacred Volume, and denying altogether the personal existence of the Holy Spirit, which they regard as merely an "influence."

It will not be necessary to enter here upon a formal examination of the doctrine that the word is the Spirit, or that the New Testament is the substitute for the Holy Spirit of apostolic times, since this en-

---

\* While Bishop Heber held this view of Revelation, he believed, at the same time, that a Divine influence was exerted upon men's minds apart from the Word. This he speaks of as a "holy energy," a "grace" necessary to "raise our affections beyond the narrow circle of mortality." This "grace" he regarded as not peculiar to the Christian Institution, but as vouchsafed to the Jews and in some measure even to the Heathen. (*Hare's Mission of the Comforter*, page 304-6. Boston Ed.)

tire treatise has an immediate bearing on this question. It will be sufficient to say here, that while this notion is plausible from the partial truth which it contains, and flattering to human pride from the position and efficacy which it assigns to the mere rational and moral faculties of men, it is altogether incompatible with Scripture teaching and with the facts of history. That the New Testament furnishes an authentic and sufficient record of the supernatural revelations and attestations to the truth of the gospel which were given in the beginning, and that these miraculous manifestations ceased when their purpose was accomplished is true. It is correct to say, therefore, that the New Testament replaces these, and that no such illuminations or miraculous demonstrations are now to be expected. It is to take, however, a most inadequate and superficial view of the office of the Holy Spirit and of Christ's promise of the Paraclete, to suppose these limited merely to the miraculous powers of the apostolic age. Miracles were then performed and revelations given by the Holy Spirit, as they had been during Christ's personal ministry, and in preceding ages, for special purposes, but were far from constituting the chief and prominent object of the mission of the Comforter. It should be remembered that the disciples, to whom Christ gave the promise that he would send them another Comforter, had already possessed and exercised miraculous powers, and had, moreover, already received the gospel presented to them in the teachings of Christ, and that they were, notwithstanding, entirely desti-

tute of that peculiar manifestation of the Spirit which was to be imparted only after the glorification of Christ, and in which he was to come to them and to continue with them to the end of the world. As Christ had been to the disciples a Comforter—a personal Helper and Guardian, he promises to them another Comforter who should be, not *with* them merely, as he had been, but *in* them, and who was thus to abide with them forever. The word and the miraculous works of the Spirit were manifestations to the *world*, but the promise of Christ was that he would manifest himself to the *disciple* differently, viz., by coming to him and making his abode with him. And this promise was based upon his keeping the words of Christ already communicated. To confound the word with the Spirit, is to assert that the world is capable of receiving the Spirit, in direct contradiction to the declaration of Christ, since the world can receive the gospel commanded to be preached to every creature. The word is indeed the instrument which the Spirit employs both in converting the world and in sanctifying saints, but it is a singular confusion of thought which mistakes the instrument for the agent, and leads men to the absurdity of making the word, the Spirit, or the author of the Spirit; while, at the same time, they speak of the Spirit as the author of the word!

Much of the rationalism and skepticism which exists, in relation to the indwelling of the Spirit, arises from the tendency which men have to demand positive definitions and palpable demonstrations in

regard to matters wholly beyond the provinces of reason and sensation, and to refuse credence to every thing which may not be actually submitted to sensible perception, or made plain to the ordinary understanding. In their vain endeavors to express what God is, in forms of human speech, metaphysical theologians presume to dogmatize and decide in regard to themes upon which the human mind should simply meditate in humble adoration. Sensuous religionists, on the other hand, soon learn to invest their gross conceptions in the habiliments of superstition, and the cherished idol of the brain becomes the material image of the shrine. Their convictions must rest upon sensible impressions, and unless they can see and feel the evidences presented, they will not believe. The unimpassioned rationalist amuses himself with the notion that he has resolved all the mysteries of the Holy Spirit, when he has persuaded himself that this Spirit is merely a visible and tangible New Testament ; while the ardent sensuist imagines himself to have realized the presence of the Spirit in some emotional excitement, some brilliant vision, or some audible revelation. Meanwhile, both agree to disregard and explain away the plainest teachings of the true Spirit of God in the Sacred Record ; and while, on the one hand, they rely upon human reason, and, on the other, seek for sensible proof, the gentle movements of the Comforter in keeping the heart and mind, and perfecting the fruits of the Christian life, are doubted and denied. In every age, sense has thus sought the victory over faith, and mere ex-



ternal forms or corporeal ministries have superseded the unseen but beneficent workings of Divine grace.

In regard to this whole subject of the Divine manifestations, the student of the Bible can not have failed to notice the marked distinction therein made as it speaks of the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit. The Father, the God of the universe, is represented as in Heaven; as there "dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto," the blessed and only Potentate (*Δυνάστης*) whom no man hath seen or can see, and as forever surrounded with all the appropriate insignia of supreme dominion, or as revealing from heaven the majesty of his power. The Son, on the other hand is revealed as the Creator of the worlds, as "the Angel of Jehovah" (Gen. xxii: 11, 12; xxxi: 11, 13, etc.,) as the Manifester and Revealer of God to men, having to them a special and peculiar relation. He is the Word made flesh, dwelling among men on earth, and thence exalted to the "right hand of the throne of the Majesty (*μεγαλωσύνης*) in the heavens;" the "Prince of the kings of earth;" the "Image of the Invisible God;" the "Judge of quick and dead," etc. It is noteworthy, however, that the Spirit is not spoken of in any way which would lead the mind to connect with it the idea of fixed locality or circumscribed presence. On the contrary, what is said of the Spirit impresses the mind with the thought of a nature, diffusive, distributable, capable of exercising its powers any where and every-where, as one all-seeing and all-comprehending Intelligence and Omnipotent Energy.

“Uphold me,” says David, “with thy Free Spirit.” Again, “Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?” or “whither shall I flee from thy presence?” It is in harmony with the conception of such a nature, that the Spirit is understood as imparted in various measures and for various purposes, in the different dispensations. Thus, “Moses,” we are told, “gathered the seventy men of the elders of the people and set them round about the tabernacle, and the Lord came down in a cloud and spake unto him, and took of the spirit that was upon him and gave it unto the seventy elders; and it came to pass that when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied and did not cease. But there remained two of the men in the camp, and the spirit rested upon them, and they prophesied in the camp.” Numb. xi: 24-26. Paul, again, in an analogous case, says: “All these worketh that one and self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.” 1 Cor. xii. Thus, the Spirit is represented as resting upon men, and imparting to them supernatural powers; as dwelling in them, in various measures or degrees, and for various purposes, maintaining, nevertheless, its own mysterious unity, and establishing it likewise in regard to all who receive it in the particular sphere in which its influence is exerted.

## CHAPTER V.

John's version of the Commission—Holy Spirit not given until after Christ's ascension—Election of Matthias not ratified—Advent of the Comforter—Its great importance—Completion of the redemptive work—The gift of the Holy Spirit literal and real.

AS some think the Spirit was given to the disciples prior to Christ's ascension, it will be proper here to consider the passage of Scripture on which this opinion is founded. It will be found in John xx: 21-23, and reads as follows: "Then said Jesus to them again, [the disciples, Thomas absent,] Peace be unto you. As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."

This is evidently John's version of the Commission given to the apostles. Christ had besought the Father when he prayed that the unity or oneness which existed between him and the Father might be extended to the disciples, (a prayer to be fulfilled, as I have shown, in the gift of the Holy Spirit.) "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." Accordingly, he here

says: "As my Father hath sent me, so send I you," and with this he connects the injunction, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit." In Matthew, he is represented as saying, "Go ye, therefore," etc., and in Mark, "Go ye into all the world," etc., while in Matthew the presence of the Spirit is implied in "I am with you alway even unto the end of the world," and in the declaration in Luke, "Behold I send the promise of my Father upon you." So also the pardon of sin conferred in the gospel, expressed by John in "Who-soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them," is implied in the language of Matthew, "Disciple all nations," since discipleship involved pardon; or in Mark by "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," or again differently in Luke, "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached among all nations." On the other hand, the rejection of the impenitent announced by John in the words "Who-soever sins ye retain, they are retained," is thus stated by Mark, "He that believeth not shall be damned." It being thus evident that the passage above quoted from John, is simply his version of the apostolic Commission, the phraseology of the other evangelists must be taken in connection and in harmony. Probably none of them give the precise words employed by Christ when he gave and fully explained to them their mission. Each gives what appeared to him its purport or substance in brief, and the differences which appear, serve to reveal that individuality which existed in each case, and was allowed to mingle itself with the terms of the revelation given. It is the earnest

and comprehensive John alone who, in his version of the commission, makes *direct* mention of the Holy Spirit—a subject on which he had dwelt so much more than all the rest in the previous part of his “Gospel.” Matthew, however, as seen above, refers to it as the *presence of Christ* with the apostles in their mission, and Luke includes it as the “promise” of the Father which was to be sent upon them, adding the command that they should “tarry at Jerusalem” until [thus] “endued with power from on high.” In allowing the Evangelists thus to explain each other, the saying in John “Receive ye the Holy Spirit,” can not be supposed to refer to the time at which it was *spoken*, but to the time at which the Spirit was appointed to be *given*, this period being still governed by the condition already made known, “If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you,” John xvi : 7. It should also be noted, that the time at which the commission was given, is not to be regarded as fixed by the order of the narrative in Matthew, Mark and John, but as being really indicated by Luke, and as occurring immediately before the ascension. Unless this period be assigned, the more unlikely view must be taken that the Commission was given at different times, and, in the first case, in the absence of Thomas, one of the eleven.\*

---

\* The neglect of strict chronological order in the simple narrations of the Evangelists is so obvious as scarcely to require mention. The mere order of narration is hence not to be unduly pressed in any case, and when we desire to arrange the facts in the proper order of sequence

Apart from these considerations, however, the passage in John xx: 21-23 does not assert that the

---

we are compelled to make considerable transposition. A strict chronological order was not specially sought by unpracticed writers who desired rather to give, in brief, the substance of those many-sided facts in the life of Christ, which, in the minds of each, connected themselves with each other, from a particular point of view. We have hence such an individuality in the testimony of each, that new light is thrown around the facts recorded, and a more complete revelation is given of the character and the work of Christ, while, at the same time, no absolute contrariety of statement is found to exist. It may well be supposed that John, for instance, desiring to record the Commission given by Christ, took advantage of the opportunity to introduce it while relating Christ's first interview with the disciples after the resurrection, it being regarded as immaterial to what particular period it was assigned between the resurrection and ascension. The same indifference as to the exact point of time, is shown in Matthew, where, from the order of narration, the Commission would seem to have been given on the mountain in Galilee where the chief portion of the brethren were assembled by the Lord's appointment. In Mark, on the other hand, where no mention is made of the assembly in Galilee, the Commission is represented as given to the eleven as they sat at meat very soon after the resurrection at Jerusalem. It is Luke alone, who, although omitting mention of the journey to Galilee, seems to indicate the time at which the Commission was actually given, since he connects it with the injunction to the disciples to "tarry at Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high." It would appear, hence, that it was given *after* the return from Galilee, and toward the close of the forty days in which, as he says in Acts i, Christ 'showed himself alive to the apostles by many infallible proofs,' and "speaking of the things concerning the kingdom of God, and being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me." Immediately after this, he adds that he led them out as far as to Bethany, from whence he ascended to heaven, thus making the Commission the last important official act of his earthly ministry.

Holy Spirit was *then* given or received. Doubtless, the fact related that Christ, in uttering these words,

---

<sup>1</sup>These points may be elucidated by enumerating the different appearances mentioned after the resurrection.

- 1st. To the Galilean women, Mary and others.
- 2d. To the two disciples on the way to Emmaus.
- 3d. To "the eleven" in the evening of the first day, Thomas absent.
- 4th. To the eleven, eight days after, when Thomas was convinced.
- 5th. To seven disciples at the Sea of Tiberias.
- 6th. To more than five hundred on the mountain in Galilee.
- 7th. To James.
- 8th. To those tarrying at Jerusalem after the visit to Galilee.

After the appearance to Mary and to the disciples going to Emmaus, the next was to the assembled apostles formerly designated officially as "the twelve," but now, since the defection of Judas, as "the eleven," an expression applied to them as a body and admitting of the temporary absence of one or two members without invalidating its current use. Paul, indeed, in 1 Cor. xv: 5 still adheres to the original designation, and says "he was seen of the twelve." It seems, from John, that Thomas was certainly absent from the society of the apostles on this occasion, so that only ten were really present, and that it was on the next appearance of Christ, eight days after, that Thomas was convinced. This period of eight days is explained by the fact that the days of unleavened bread, with their offerings, continuing until Friday and this day being succeeded by the Sabbath, the disciples would, as a matter of course, remain at Jerusalem until the first day of the week succeeding that of the resurrection. Immediately after this, the visit to Galilee seems to have taken place, where Christ appeared first to those fishing at the Sea of Tiberias and then to the entire body of disciples convened upon the mountain. Subsequently, he appears specially to James, (1 Cor. xv: 7,) perhaps to direct the return of the apostles to Jerusalem, where he again "assembled with them" during the remainder of the forty days, delivering the Commission at their close, immediately before his final departure, and enjoining them to remain at Jerusalem until the descent of the Spirit.

"breathed upon them," tends to convey the impression that the Spirit was then communicated, though not necessarily so. For this may be justly regarded as an emblematic or prophetic act, probably with an analogical reference to the inbreathing of the "breath" or spirit of life into Adam, whose body God had just formed. Christ had now before him his spiritual body, the church, in its outward manifestation in the world, and might well signify by this expressive act of breathing upon it, that it was to receive, in the Holy Spirit shortly to be imparted, that Divine life and power which would fit it for its mission. It was as yet as one of the forms seen by Ezekiel, "when the sinews and the flesh had come up upon them, but there was no breath in them," and when he was commanded to prophesy unto the wind, and say to the wind: "Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these . . . that they may live." Christ seems here to have impressively prefigured what was shortly to come to pass, thus continuing still to direct the attention of the apostles to that eventful moment when the kingdom of heaven should be formally established, and when they should be "endued with power from on high." Should any one, however, be disposed to regard the passage we have been considering as indicating at least an actual impartation of supernatural spiritual discernment, as a special gift adapted to the existing circumstances of the disciples, this view would not conflict with the fact that the Holy Spirit *himself* was not given until Pentecost, inasmuch as



supernatural powers of various kinds had, as shown above, repeatedly been given already, and were matters quite distinct from the promise in question. Those who take this view, can find in Luke's declaration, "Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures," and in Peter's application of the prophecies to Judas just before Pentecost (Acts i: 16-22), a plausible ground for their opinion, though it seems scarce proper to suppose immediate inspiration necessary to account for results which might have been but natural consequences of those teachings and explanations and applications of Scripture, which the disciples had received from Christ himself after his resurrection, during the forty days in which he was "speaking to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Acts i: 3.\*

---

\* I subjoin Dean Alford's note on John xx: 22: "To understand this verse as the outpouring of the Spirit, the fulfillment of the promise of the Comforter, is against all consistency, and most against John himself. See ch. xvi: 7, and ch. xx: 17. To understand it rightly, we have merely to recur to that great key to the meaning of so many dark passages of Scripture, the manifold and gradual unfolding of promise and prophecy in their fulfillment. The presence of the Lord among them *now* was a slight and temporary fulfillment of his promise of returning to them, and so the imparting of the Spirit *now* was a symbol and foretaste of that which they should receive at Pentecost; just as, to mount a step higher, that *itself*, in its present abiding with us, is but the first-fruits and pledge (Rom. viii: 23; 2 Cor. i: 22) of the fullness which we shall hereafter inherit. 'The relation of this saying to the effusion of the Spirit is the same which ch. iii bears to Baptism; ch. vi, to the Lord's Supper; ch. xvii: 1, to the Ascension,'

With far more probability, however, is it supposed by many that Peter's course on that occasion was dictated by that forward zeal characteristic of him, and that it was not sanctioned by Divine authority. The determination of the choice of an apostle by the Jewish custom of casting the lot, indicates clearly that the disciples did not then possess the Holy Spirit, for this method appears not to have been afterward employed, but, under the guidance of the Spirit after Pentecost, those who were to be Divinely called to special ministries were expressly designated *by name* through a supernatural medium, as in the case of Paul (Acts ix: 4), Ananias (Acts ix: 10),

---

etc. (Luthardt.) Further, this giving of the Spirit was not the Spirit personally imparting of himself to them, but only a partial instilling of his influence. He proceeds forth in his work (as in His essence) from the Father and the Son: This breathing of his influence was an imparting of him from the Son in his risen body, but that body had not yet been received up, without which union of the God—manhood of the Son—to the glory of the Father, the Holy Spirit would not come. What was now conferred is plain from v. 23, by which authority to discern spirits and pronounce on them is re-assured (See Mat. xviii: 18); and from Luke v. 45, by which a discerning of the mind of the Spirit is given to them. We find instances of both these gifts being exercised by Peter in Acts i, in his assertion of the sense of Scripture and his judgment of Judas. Both these, however, were only temporary and imperfect. *That no final gifts of apostleship were now formally conferred is plain by the absence of Thomas*, who, in that case, would be no apostle in the same sense in which the rest were." It will be seen that Alford's view agrees in the main points with that above given. The notion of a *partial* return and a *partial* inspiration does not seem to me at all warranted. The "going away" of which Christ spoke was his ascension to the Father. His "coming again" to the disciples was *in* the Holy Spirit. See John xiv: 17-19, 23; xvi: 15, 23-28.

Timothy (1 Tim. i: 18; iv: 14), Paul and Barnabas (Acts xiii: 2), Peter (Acts x: 5, 19), etc. Certain it is, that the name of Matthias never afterward appears in the Divine record, and that Paul was subsequently chosen, as had been the other apostles, by our Lord himself in person, thus completing *their entire number*, as determined in the symbols of the Apocalypse, where the foundations of the new Jerusalem are represented as having in them "the names of the *twelve* apostles of the Lamb." Rev. xxi: 14. The appointment of Matthias was hence not Divinely recognized as authoritative and permanent. It had not been commanded by the Holy Spirit, nor had the Holy Spirit yet been given to illuminate the minds of the disciples in regard to their proper functions.

Having thus considered the *only* passage in the New Testament which seems to imply the giving of the Holy Spirit prior to the day of Pentecost, and found it to be incorrectly applied, we now come to the actual fulfillment of the great promise of the gospel. It may be truly said, that the gift of the Holy Spirit to the Church, was an event as marked and as definite as the advent of Christ himself. Like the latter, it was specially foretold by the ancient prophets, and announced by John the Baptist. More emphatically still, was it repeatedly dwelt upon by the great Prophet, Christ himself. It forms, in fact, one of the great epochs in human affairs. It was the introduction of a Divine presence upon earth which had never here thus dwelt before, and which was now to secure and complete *in* man that salva-

tion which a suffering Christ had effected *for* man. Until the special work of Christ was finished, therefore, the Comforter could not come. The Redeemer must first enter into the true Holy Place to appear in the presence of God for men. He must first "ascend on high and lead captivity captive, before he received gifts for men, even for the rebellious, that the Lord God might dwell among them" by the Spirit. Thus alone could this Divine presence enter into the sanctuary of the human heart, to shed abroad there the sweet incense of the love of God, in its revelation of Christ, in renewing, sanctifying, justifying, and redeeming man; the whole great work of salvation being briefly comprehended in two things, the gift of Christ *for* man and the gift of the Holy Spirit *to* man. Both were necessary to the full accomplishment of the purposes of God, in revealing himself to humanity through a series of progressive illuminations and developments. For while the great promise of the Old Testament and the hope of the ancient saints, was the coming of Christ, the Messiah; this was no sooner fulfilled, than the great remaining promise was the advent of the Holy Spirit, to complete the work of renovation.

It was in direct reference to this completion of the plan of salvation, that the apostles, in the Commission, were commanded to baptize believers "into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." The entire Godhead was thus expressed, as fully and finally manifested in the redemption of the world—a tri-unity, already made known in anticipation at the

baptism of Jesus, when the *Father* announced the *Son* and when the *Holy Spirit*, in a bodily form, descended and abode upon him. Not only in these incontrovertible evidences, but in all Christ's communications to the disciples upon this subject, the personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit are clearly implied, while at the same time the unity of God is constantly maintained. The Father had been manifested to them in Christ, and they were now taught to look for another Paraclete, a new and permanent manifestation of God, which was to abide with them forever. For the accomplishment of this Divine promise, accordingly, the disciples now waited at Jerusalem. And it was at the culmination of the Pentecostal season, on the day of first fruits—a day supposed to have been observed also in commemoration of the giving of the Law on Sinai, that this momentous promise was fulfilled.

It was about ten days after the ascension of Christ. The apostles had continued daily in prayer and supplication with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus and with his brethren. The number of the names together, we are told, was about one hundred and twenty, and, as the eventful hour approached, they were all gathered together with one accord in one place. "Suddenly," as Luke relates, "there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to

speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." These marvels being quickly noised abroad, a multitude of the Jews, dwellers at Jerusalem and strangers from foreign countries, immediately assembled, and being astonished to hear, in their own native languages, the wonderful works of God related with all the fervor of inspiration, by these humble Galileans, were led to ask the meaning of the prodigy, while others scoffingly attributed the whole to the excitement produced by wine. But Peter, standing up with the eleven, at once repels this imputation, and, in words of truth and soberness, refers his auditors to the prophecy of Joel as herein now fulfilled in the actual bestowment of the Holy Spirit. Having secured their attention, he goes on to declare to them, with authority and power, that in Jesus of Nazareth they had slain the Prince of Life, but that God, having raised him from the dead according to the express predictions of David and the prophets, had exalted him to his own right hand in the heavens, constituting him both Lord and Christ, in evidence of which, having received of the Father the promised Holy Spirit, he had now shed forth that which they then "saw and heard." Convinced of the truths thus declared and demonstrated, and pierced to the heart by the consciousness of their guilt before God, the people earnestly inquire of the apostles what they should do. Upon which, Peter commands them to "repent and be baptized for the remission of sins," assuring them that they too should receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, "for," said he, "the promise is to

you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

This, then, was the first fulfillment of the promise which Christ gave to his disciples, that he would send them another Comforter to abide with them forever, and, in the literal fact thus recorded, we have the proper application and explanation of the many allusions and references to the giving of the Holy Spirit found in the Evangelists, whether these references be figurative or literal. The Holy Spirit had now been imparted to the body of Christ, the church, to pervade all its members and establish and maintain among them, to the end of time, that unity for which Jesus had offered up his petitions to the Father. The imagery in which this momentous fact is foretold is glowing, striking, and forcible, as might naturally be expected from the prophetic style, but more especially from the important nature of the fact itself. The vivid character of these annunciations, and the impartation of miraculous endowments which often, in apostolic times, attended the gift of the Spirit, have led many to erroneous conceptions as to what really constitutes this gift, and it will be proper here to consider the figures employed, as well as some of the cases recorded, as illustrative of what is actually meant by the "gift of the Holy Spirit."

## CHAPTER VI

Metaphorical expressions relating to the gift of the Spirit—*Outpouring, Drinking, Baptizing*—Various impartations of the Spirit, direct, indirect—The fact the same in all cases—Unity effected by one Spirit—Supernatural powers a transient accompaniment.

IT is in the prophecy of Joel, quoted by Peter on the day of Pentecost, that the idea of a '*pouring out*' of the Spirit was first expressed. It is employed twice in the prophecy, and once by Peter, ver. 33, where he says, "He hath *shed* forth this which ye now see and hear." It is also used by Luke, (Acts x: 45,) and once by Paul, (Titus iii: 6,) where he speaks of the Holy Spirit being "*shed* on us abundantly," the same verb being used in all these cases in the original. As a literal outpouring of the Spirit is, from the very nature of the case, impossible and inconceivable, the mind naturally seeks in the familiar fact of the pouring out of a fluid, some analogy or resemblance by which it may be enabled to apprehend, in some measure at least, the mysterious fact revealed. This is readily and naturally found in the descent of the Spirit from above, and in the distribution of his Divine influence among the disciples. The Holy Spirit was "sent down from heaven," and each believer was manifestly imbued or endowed by



Him with new powers and qualities, circumstances quite sufficient to justify the use, and exhaust the application, of the metaphor in question. It does not require, therefore, any of the concomitants, as the sound of a "mighty rushing wind," or "cloven tongues like as of fire," etc., to complete its signification. The very same expression, indeed, is used by Paul (Titus iii: 6,) to indicate the simple impartation of the Spirit to believers in general. Here, speaking of the common salvation, he says: "He saved us—by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit which he shed (poured out) on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."

Again, in an allusive sense differing from this, the Spirit is repeatedly compared to water, as in Christ's language to the woman of Samaria: "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink, thou wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water.—Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again: but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water springing up unto everlasting life." John iv: 10-14. On another occasion, on the great day of a Jewish passover, Jesus stood and cried, "If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." ("But this," adds John, "he spake of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive.") John vii:

37-39. The figure here is plainly designed to illustrate the blessings—the grateful and life-giving influences which were to be enjoyed by the believer, and to flow from him to others, through the possession of the Spirit; and there is no more propriety in supposing, in the former case, a literal outpouring of the Spirit, than to imagine in this, a literal drinking of the Spirit. Paul (1 Cor. xii: 13,) uses the same metaphor when he says “we have all been made to drink of\* one Spirit.”

There is another metaphor used in reference to the giving of the Holy Spirit, viz., where this is called a *baptizing*. This is not derived, as some incorrectly suppose, from any peculiar circumstances connected specially with the giving of the Spirit on *Pentecost*. The expression was first employed by the Father himself in giving to John the Baptist a criterion by which he might recognize the Messiah. He sent John to baptize in water, and said to him, “Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Spirit.” “And I saw and bare record,” adds John, “that this is the Son of God.” John i: 33, 34. It was thus made a distinguishing characteristic of the Messiah, that he should possess the power to baptize in the Holy Spirit, and the appropriateness of the metaphor is evidently to be found

---

\*The word here rendered “into” in the common version, is rejected by the best commentators, as Lachman, Tischendorf, Alford, and Tregelles.

in a resemblance between this figurative baptism and the literal baptism performed by John, with which it is contrasted, and from which the metaphor is taken. The baptism (immersion) practiced by John, involved as its chief idea, an overwhelming, a sudden and complete overpowering of the person submerged by water, and the entering into conditions and relations wholly new. In like manner, the baptism of the Spirit was to imply an equally entire subjugation and overmastery of the soul by the Spirit which pervaded it; an immediate and complete change and renovation. The Christian, accordingly, is to be "led by the Spirit," to "walk in the Spirit," to subject his entire nature to its control, and, in receiving it, he enters at once into relations and experiences before unknown. It is in these obvious analogies, that the propriety and appositeness of the figure may be seen, and its proper application understood. The same tropical use is made of the term baptism where Christ says of his sufferings and death, (Luke xii: 50,) "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" See also Matt. xx: 22, 23; Mark x: 38, etc. To carry out resemblances too far, or to mistake resemblances for identities, is to run into gross materialistic speculations unwarranted by the Word of God. It is sufficient to know that *literally* there is no such thing as a "pouring out" of the Spirit, or a "drinking" of the Spirit, or a "baptism" in the Spirit, but that these are all alike metaphors, designed, by the resemblances they suggest, to present to the mind, in various aspects

and from various points of view, the most lively and correct ideas possible of a fact, which, in whatever form or imagery it may be clothed, *itself always remains the same*, and is simply and *unfiguratively* the impartation or *gift of the Holy Spirit to those who believe*.

None of the metaphors to which we have adverted, express the important nature and the striking results of the gift of the Spirit, so fully, as that one in which it is compared to a baptism. The thoroughness and completeness of the change effected, and the entire subordination of the human nature to a new supremacy, are here clearly pictured forth in a single descriptive term. We find it employed, accordingly, on several occasions in Scripture, and we may particularly notice that it is selected to set forth and emphasize the impartation of the Spirit as a special prerogative and characteristic of Christ. John might baptize in water. The disciples of Christ might baptize in water. Men were competent to fulfill such ministries as these; but it was Christ *alone* who could baptize in the Holy Spirit. He did not, hence, *personally* baptize any one in water. His own office was to impart a spiritual baptism,—to give to every believer the Spirit of God. This was something of a far different and more exalted nature, implying the possession of a power, dignity, and authority beyond all human conception, involving in itself the very attribute and essence of Deity; for the thought could not for a moment be entertained that a mere man could enter upon such a function as this. Yet it is

announced as the characteristic office of Christ to John the Baptist, who, accordingly, when Christ demanded a baptism in water, was surprised, and refused at first, saying, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" "Suffer it to be so now," replied Jesus, "for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." \*

This peculiar function, the impartation of the Holy Spirit, with great propriety appertains to Christ, since the Church to which it is communicated is his body, and he is himself represented as the head from which life and power proceed. Peter, therefore, said: "Having received of the Father the promise of the Spirit (i. e., the promised Spirit,) he hath shed forth this which you now see and hear." It was on the day

---

\* It was proper that Jesus, as the Son of God, should ratify the ministry of John, by submitting, as a Jew, to the baptism which God had ordained. It was proper, moreover, that in setting up the kingdom of God on earth, he should himself, as an example to his followers, comply with its requisitions. Up to this moment, he appeared in a divided relation, allied, on the one hand, to God as his father, and, on the other, to Mary as his mother, and in subjection to both. The time had now arrived, when the maternal relation was to be merged and lost in a new and symbolic birth, a birth of water, it being appointed to all who should enter the kingdom of heaven, now announced, that they should be "born of water and of the Spirit." From this time, consequently; the position of Jesus to his mother was entirely changed. He was now wholly consecrated to his spiritual mission, and on various occasions indicated, in a manner sufficiently marked, the entire abrogation of all maternal authority, and his entire devotion to those higher spiritual relations in respect to which he said: "My mother and my brethren are those who hear the Word of God and do it." Luke viii: 21.

of Pentecost that Christ first imparted the Holy Spirit to the Church, according to his express declaration shortly before, where he himself employs the very same analogy with John's baptism formerly introduced. "John indeed," said he, "baptized in water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit, not many days hence." This repetition of the expression, at different times, and by different persons, and that, too, with a constant and direct reference to the baptism of John, while it evinces the source and scope of the metaphor, shows also its appositeness to express, in a brief and striking manner, the sudden and marked change effected by the gift of the Spirit. It was not to be a mere affusion, but an immersion, an overwhelming, a complete and thorough overmastery and renovation of those subjected to it.

The next occasion on which there seems to have been a renewed impartation of the Spirit, was when Peter and John were imprisoned, and brought before the priests and rulers for preaching "through Jesus, the resurrection of the dead." Being released, it is said they returned to their own company, and earnest prayer was then offered up that with all boldness they might speak the word of God, and that wonders and signs might be accomplished by the name of Jesus. "Immediately," we are informed, "the place was shaken where they were assembled, and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit." Here there was no gift of languages conferred, no "tongues as of fire," since this charism they already possessed, and no sound as of a "rushing, mighty wind," but the place

where they were was shaken, as a similar sensible evidence of an answer to their prayers, and they were all filled with the Spirit. They had not prayed for the Spirit, but for those things which the Spirit alone could impart, and it is accordingly "the supply of the Spirit" which is given. This fact shows that the Spirit was given in various measures according to the circumstances, and that when persecution and imminent peril demanded a stronger degree of courage and fortitude, these qualities were imparted by bestowing a larger measure of the Spirit of God; it being one of the offices of the Spirit to strengthen with might the inner man, and fill the soul with a divine peace and calmness in the hour of trial. On this occasion, accordingly, we read that "they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke the word of God with boldness." The same language was used of them on Pentecost, "they were all filled with the Holy Spirit," but we are not to suppose that the spiritual strength, then imparted, had been at all diminished, only that, on this second occasion, a larger measure was demanded by the urgency of the crisis, the powers of darkness now being fairly roused to opposition. Paul, in Phil. 1: 19, 20, refers to the same things when he says: "I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, according to my earnest expectation, and my hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed: but that with all boldness, as always, so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death."

The next occasion recorded on which there was a *direct* impartation of the Holy Spirit, was at the calling of the Gentiles. Here Peter had no sooner announced the gospel to Cornelius and his household, than "the Holy Spirit fell on all them which heard the word," and the believing Jews present, we are told, were astonished because "on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit, for they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God." Whether or not there appeared on this occasion, as at Pentecost, "cloven tongues like as of fire," is not stated, but it is most probable that the same symbolic appearances attended, as the same gift was imparted, and this seems to be even implied in what Peter says when rehearsing the matter to the other apostles. "The Holy Spirit fell on them *as on us* at the beginning." This reference to the beginning, indicates like visible and audible manifestations accompanying the giving of the Spirit, for as to the giving of the Spirit apart from these, this had repeatedly taken place since "the beginning" referred to.

In this account, we find the usual terms and metaphors employed—"The Holy Spirit *fell* on all"—"On the Gentiles also was *poured out* the gift of the Holy Spirit;" and Peter in relating the fact adds: "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit." Here we have the same figurative and allusive expressions already considered. The Spirit "*fell*," was sent down from heaven. It is, therefore, compared to a "pouring



out." The effect of its reception was a sudden and complete revolution in regard to the recipients. It is, therefore, compared to an immersion or an overwhelming. But by all these is meant substantially nothing more than the literal fact that the Holy Spirit was given and received, the manner of giving and the effect of the gift merely, being embodied in these expressive metaphors. Hence adds Peter in plain and literal language, "Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us,—what was I, that I could withstand God?" All these metaphorical expressions are then thus reduced to the simple statement, "God gave them the like gift." It was, in all the cases, the impartation of the Holy Spirit, no more, no less. Literally, there was no "falling of the Spirit," no "outpouring," no "baptism," these metaphors being used merely to give a more lively or vivid idea of the simple fact—the gift of the Holy Spirit.

This will appear still more clearly when we consider those cases in which the Spirit was given indirectly through the laying on of hands. As the Father had sent Jesus, so Jesus sent the apostles and others as his special ambassadors, and, along with other credentials, conferred upon them the power of obtaining the gift of the Holy Spirit through prayer and the imposition of hands. This became to them accordingly a very important function and a most expressive mark of the high position which they occupied as the immediate vicegerents of Christ himself. It was, indeed, still the Lord himself, who, in

these, as in other cases, gave the Holy Spirit ; but the apostles were allowed to designate, through prayer and the laying on of hands, the individuals upon whom the gift might properly be bestowed. This, in order to throw around the apostolic office its proper sanctions, seems to have been the general rule in all places where the apostles labored, and this power seems to have been restricted to them and to a few others specially commissioned for the purpose. Thus, when the people of Samaria received the gospel from Philip the evangelist, they were baptized, but remained for a time without the Holy Spirit, as we are expressly informed "he had fallen on none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." When the apostles at Jerusalem learned "that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come down, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit—Then laid they their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit." That this impartation of the Spirit was accompanied by visible tokens, is evident from what is said of Simon Magus, that "when he *saw* that through laying on of the apostles hands, the Holy Spirit was given." There must have been, therefore, sensible miraculous attestations of the fact here, as in other cases, and the ambition of the sorcerer was roused so that he sought to purchase from the apostles a similar power. Peter, therefore, said to him. "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money." It was still "the gift of God,"

though given through the apostles, and its ministration was evidently chiefly confined to them during their ministry. Thus Paul, finding at Ephesus twelve disciples of John, inquired of them, "Have you received the Holy Spirit since you believed?" Upon their answering in the negative, we further read that when, after their baptism, Paul laid his hands upon them, "the Holy Spirit came on them and they spake with tongues and prophesied." Again in Galatians iii: 5, Paul asks: "He that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" To minister or supply the Spirit was thus a characteristic and important part of the apostolic office in all the regions to which their ministry extended. It does not appear, however, that in regions to which scattered members may have carried the gospel, and where it was believed and obeyed, the Holy Spirit was not imparted directly, without apostolic intermediation. It was one of the promises of the gospel itself, and to be sought and received through prayer, and seems to have been connected with the apostolic office for the reasons assigned, only in the places to which their immediate labors extended. Thus, the church at Rome was evidently in possession of the Spirit before any apostle had visited that city; and the Ethiopian eunuch, who went on his way rejoicing, doubtless enjoyed the same blessing, without which he could not have become a member of the body of Christ. Nor was the power of imparting the Spirit wholly restricted to the apostles. Paul himself

received this gift through the laying on of the hands of a disciple specially deputed for the purpose: "Brother Saul," said Ananias, "the Lord, (even Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest,) hath sent me unto thee, that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit." Acts ix: 17. There was then no invincible necessity that the impartation of the Spirit should be restricted to the apostles alone, though this function was evidently attached to their mission in general for the reasons just given.

Some, in reference to this point, distinguishing between what they call the ordinary gift of the Spirit and the miraculous powers, assert that the former in all cases immediately attended obedience to the gospel, and that it was the latter alone that was confided to the apostles. That the apostles possessed the power of imparting special charisms is evident from Rom. i: 11; 2 Tim. i: 6, etc., but there seems to be no authority for restricting their agency to the impartation of mere miraculous powers. The language used in reference to their exercise of the power committed to them is extremely definite. They communicated the Holy Spirit, (the *δωρεάν*), the gift of God, and not a charism only, and, in the case of the Samaritans, it is expressly stated that the Holy Spirit had previously fallen upon none of them. They had been merely baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and remained, for a season, without the indwelling presence of the Spirit.

The reason of this delay, has been variously under-

stood. The most probable one is, that it was purposely designed to secure, among the Samaritans, a proper respect for the apostolic office. Astonished at the signs and wonders wrought by Philip the Evangelist, and rejoicing in the knowledge of the gospel which he had preached to them, they would be very naturally disposed to magnify unduly his office and position. This people, who from the paucity of their religious knowledge and their ardent expectation of a Messiah, had already been carried away by the false pretensions of Simon, were doubtless at this time easily impressed by the marvelous, and probably disposed to exalt beyond measure the personal claims and character of Philip. The withholding from them, for a time, the Holy Spirit, the proper seal of the ministry of the gospel, and the need thence arising for the presence of some of the apostles, would tend at once to correct such erroneous conceptions and give to the apostles their proper position and authority before the people.

Neander, indeed, thinks that it was entirely within the province of Philip to have obtained, through the gospel and prayer, the gift of the Holy Spirit for these converts. If so, it was singular that this was not done, and that the history confines exclusively here to Peter and to John the imparting of the Holy Spirit. It is, doubtless, true, however, as before remarked that, in regions remote from the scene of apostolic labors, the simple ministration and obedience of the gospel was attended with the fulfillment of all the Divine promises connected with it, and that

religious communities could be founded in which the Spirit of God dwelt, and to which it imparted all the charisms needed for edification, without any special ministry on the part of apostles. The reason for the delay, in the case of the Samaritans, supposed by Neander, is briefly this, that their minds, as yet imperfectly enlightened, and much bewildered by the sorceries of Simon, were not in a proper condition to receive the Spirit of God ; and that his presence was therefore delayed until, by means of further instruction and prayer, they were suitably prepared. He contrasts this case, furthermore, with that of the house of Cornelius where, in consequence of their hearts having been purified by faith, the Spirit was given in advance of baptism, or any public profession of the gospel. That a proper state of the heart has much to do with the enjoyment of the Holy Spirit, is undoubtedly true, but the condition of the Samaritans, who are represented as having believed Philip "preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," and as having been "baptized, both men and women," can scarcely be supposed to have been unfit for either the remission of sins or the presence of the Spirit. Nor does it seem proper to assign, in the case of Cornelius, any other reason for the gift of the Spirit prior to formal obedience, than the one which is plainly implied in the narrative itself, viz., to convince the Jews, by irresistible evidence, that God had "granted to the Gentiles also repentance unto life." Neither prophecies nor special visions were sufficient to overcome

the intensity of Jewish prejudices. It was the simple fact of the impartation to the Gentiles of the Holy Spirit, by which unity was to be established in the body of Christ, which at once removed every lingering doubt. Unless this had been *first* done, they would not have been received to baptism or admitted to fellowship with the church. The fact undoubtedly shows, furthermore, that God did not formerly forbear to give his Holy Spirit to those whose hearts were purified by faith, even without baptism, and that a want of faith, therefore, is the only insuperable obstacle to the reception of the Spirit. It is, then, a just conclusion, that he does not now withhold this precious gift from any true believer, even though he may, from ignorance of his duty, have remained unbaptized, in this age of religious error and confusion. This is a corollary indeed which *necessarily* follows from the concession that God has a people scattered among all religious parties.

It has now been seen, by an induction of the various cases, that the Holy Spirit was sometimes bestowed directly, and, at other times, by the laying on of the hands of apostles, or of some special agent chosen for the purpose. It remains to be shown, that the metaphors which we have been considering are applied *alike* in these different cases, and that the distinctions which some have attempted to make in regard to them, are absolutely without foundation. It is asserted, for instance, that the metaphor of a "baptism" is applicable only to the cases of Pentecost and the house of Cornelius. Yet, it must be

admitted that, in the case of the Samaritans, the gift of the Spirit through the laying on of hands was attended with visible demonstrations of power, such as were given at Jerusalem and in other cases. Again, when Paul laid hands on the twelve disciples at Ephesus, we are told that the "Holy Spirit came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied." Here the Spirit is represented as "coming" or falling on them (hence an outpouring), and we have briefly, but in substance, precisely what occurred on Pentecost. There was also a complete change effected in the state and relations of these disciples of John, and there is hence equal propriety here in the use of the figure of a baptism. All difficulty, indeed, in regard to these expressions vanishes at once, when it is understood that they are simply metaphors, designed to give, by similitude, a lively idea of a momentous literal fact which is, itself, constantly the same, and remains unaffected by the particular term or phrase used to designate it. In no subject, perhaps, except that of religion, would men depart so far from common sense and common usage, as to mistake a figure for a fact, or endeavor to make a fact subordinate and subservient to the figures under which it is presented.

It should be remembered that the whole discussion which has been carried on in relation to these terms is a debate about *words*, and not about things. The thing remains the same, it matters not by what term it is designated, and it is differently designated because it may be looked at from different points of view, and presents itself in different aspects. It would be



an absurdity to suppose that baptism in the Spirit was one thing, and an outpouring of the Spirit another, and the drinking of the Spirit a still different matter. It can not be too often repeated, that these are all alike figures designed to present, in various lights, the simple fact of the gift of the Spirit to believers.

Finally, however, we have in what Paul says, 1 Cor. xii: 13,\* a very full and positive illustration

---

\* This passage has been strangely misinterpreted. 1. Some have supposed the "baptism in or by the Spirit" to be the impartation of miraculous powers, and they so understand also the outpouring of the Spirit on Pentecost. The idea entertained of baptism must indeed be sufficiently vague when men can imagine that a mere "charism" such as the gift of tongues, or the interpretation of tongues, or the discerning of spirits could merit the title of a "baptism." Such a view is not only absurd in itself, but incompatible with the facts and with the language here used by the apostle. It is perfectly well known that all did not possess "charisms," and that there were in the church the "unlearned" and the "private" members who possessed neither official position nor supernatural gifts. But Paul here affirms of *all*, Jew and Greek, bond and free, that they had been baptized by one Spirit. Moreover, "charisms" were not conferred upon aliens to bring them into the "one body" or church, but upon those who were already members of the church in order to the general edification of the whole. Neither could the cessation of such gifts, either entirely or in part, at all affect the real connection of any one with the body of Christ.

2. Le Clerc and others imagine the apostle to refer here to water-baptism, as persons are elsewhere said to be therein "baptized into Christ" and to "put on Christ." Baptism in water certainly establishes a *formal* union with the body of Christ, and all, "both Jew and Greek, bond and free," were thus brought into the one body, as it existed visibly in the world. A certain plausibility hence attaches itself to this interpretation, by which the superficial are misled. But Paul

of the Scripture use of these expressions. He says, when treating of the gifts of the Spirit and the unity of the body of Christ, "by one Spirit are we all bap-

---

was not here treating of any mere *formal* union, or *professed* adherence to Christ. His subject is the *real* spiritual *unity* which exists in the body of Christ. He is regarding the members of the church here throughout, not as such because of any visible or formal connection, but because they are animated and actuated by "the one and the self-same Spirit." He shows that however various the gifts of individuals, it is the same Spirit by which they are communicated, and is careful to repeat, again and again, when mentioning the different gifts, that they are all alike imparted by the same Spirit, "dividing to every man severally as he will." Referring now to the human body, he declares that as this is *one* and yet has many members, "so also is Christ"—that is, the entire spiritual community contemplated as a body with Christ as its head. The human body is one, because it is animated by one Spirit; and the apostle thence illustrates the unity of the body of Christ. He infers this unity, not from any visible or formal union of the members with the body, such as water-baptism might effect; but from the fact that all the members were pervaded by one Spirit, and the thirteenth verse constitutes the very premises on which he bases his proposition. He argues that every one, "Jew or Greek, bond or free," who was a real member of Christ's body, had become such by being baptized by or in "one Spirit," and by being "made to drink of one Spirit." Christ had promised, and that too without any restriction or limitation, that believers should be baptized in the Holy Spirit; and Peter had applied Joel's prophecy of this to the Jews, and to all who were afar off (the Gentiles), even to as many as would be truly "called." Christ, employing another metaphor, had declared that "whosoever thirsted should come to him and drink, and that the water he would give should be a well of water in the believer, springing up unto everlasting life." The reception of the Holy Spirit, thus figuratively expressed, was a fact realized by those whom Paul addressed, and he hence appeals to this consciousness, as well as to the fact expressed in these familiar and appropriate metaphors, as indubitable evidence that it was "one and the self-same Spirit" by which all the different members of Christ's body were imbued and actuated.

tized into one body, whether we be Jew or Gentile, whether we be bond or free, and have all been made to drink of one Spirit." We have here two of the metaphors in question—that of a baptism and a "drinking" of the Spirit. He expressly and positively affirms that *all* had received this baptism; that *all* had been made to drink of one Spirit. It mattered not how or through what instrumentality the Holy Spirit was given, it remained true of all that they had received this spiritual baptism, and had been made partakers of the same Spirit. The

---

A reference to water-baptism here, as supposed, would have been absurd. It would have been nothing to the purpose. It could have proved nothing, since he was not arguing unity from the connection of the members with the body, but from the fact that all were pervaded by one Spirit. It is strange that any should so misconceive the apostle's train of thought here, more especially as all ought to know that water-baptism does not establish even *union* among professors of Christianity, much less *unity*. All who practice water-baptism are not united into one body thereby, for there are many parties of immersionists. But if water-baptism had even the power of effecting *union* in one body, this would be a matter wholly different from that *unity* of which Paul is here speaking.

The language which he uses, however, is so extremely definite as utterly to forbid such an interpretation. The logical arrangement of the words, "in one Spirit" being placed in the beginning of the sentence rather than in its natural place after the verb, shows this to be emphatic and to contain the principal or leading thought. The use of *ἐν* also, which, especially with the verb in the passive, can not be otherwise rendered than by "in" as denoting the element in which the baptism took place, or if even translated "by," must have respect to the means or instrumentality by which the baptism was effected, is quite sufficient to determine the meaning, so that neither critically nor exegetically, is there the slightest ground for the interpretation under review.

apostle is here speaking, not of the spiritually gifted in the church of Corinth, but of the entire church or body of Christ (v. 28), in which God had set apostles, prophets, and all the various ministries appertaining to it, as having had *all* its members thus baptized into one body. The language is remarkable for its universality, "all, whether Jews or Gentiles, bond or free"—Peter and Cornelius, Onesimus and Philemon, *all* in every place who called on the name of the Lord and enjoyed the salvation of the gospel. And let it be distinctly noted that Paul includes *himself* among the number. "We," says he, "have all been baptized by one Spirit into one body." Now, Paul, as we have seen, simply received the Holy Spirit through the laying on of the hands of Ananias. The simple communication of the Spirit then involved a baptism and an outpouring. Its reception was, in all cases, a "drinking" of the Spirit, "for this spake Jesus of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive." Like the other metaphors, this was equally applicable to all who believed, just as were also the other expressions intended to denote the same literal fact from a point of view somewhat different. None of them, nor all of them together, could possibly imply or amount to *more* than the simple fact they were designed to express, *the communication and reception of the Holy Spirit*. The metaphor of pouring out exhibits the act of the Giver. The figure of a baptism represents the effect upon the receiver. The drinking of the Spirit expresses the eager and voluntary participa-

tion of the believer in the spiritual blessings vouchsafed. The pouring out did not constitute the baptism. This figurative baptism was a *result* or *consequence* of the pouring out of the Spirit, which, with the utmost propriety, is made to precede it, and without which there could have been no baptism. And let it be noted, that it was not a *sprinkling*, but a pouring out, and this so copious and abundant that an immersion or overwhelming was a natural and necessary result as it respected the recipients. It is, therefore, in entire congruity with the circumstances, and with the fact itself, that the figure of a baptism is used. An overwhelming is the very first conception which naturally arises when a fluid is copiously poured out from above upon those beneath, and all the accompanying incidents recorded are such as to give precisely the idea of such a pouring out. The sound of "a mighty rushing wind filling the place where they were sitting," the recorded fact that they were "all *filled* with the Holy Spirit," and all the glowing prophetic imagery employed to describe the event, show, unequivocally, that the figure of a baptism or overwhelming was the most appropriate that could be selected to convey a lively idea of the effect resulting in respect to those who received the Spirit.

It is not to be supposed, however, that these extraordinary concomitants were at all *essentially* connected with the giving of the Spirit. There was great propriety that the first communication of the Spirit should be thus specially signalized, just as the advent of Christ was marked in an especial manner

by various angelic visitations and miraculous appearances. Nor is there the slightest reason to suppose that the Holy Spirit was not just as fully and as freely imparted to every single individual subsequently, without any of these extraneous manifestations, as it was on the day of Pentecost. It so happens, indeed, that amidst the wonderful *previsions* and provisions of revelation, we are furnished with direct and express testimony in regard to this point. For Paul, in speaking to Titus of the common salvation says, he saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he shed [poured out] on us ABUNDANTLY (*πλουσίως richly*) through Jesus Christ our Saviour, etc.

Here the fact of an *abundant pouring out on all the saved* is distinctly asserted. We have already seen how Paul, 1 Cor. xii: 13, makes a *universal* application to all believers of the metaphors *baptism* of the Spirit, and *drinking* of the Spirit. We now see that, in the letter to Titus, he makes a similar *universal* application of the figure of a *pouring out* of the Spirit, employing the very same term (*ἐκχέω*) which is used on the occasion of Pentecost. And it is worthy of special notice, that here again, as in 1 Cor. xii: 13, in his application of the term *he includes himself*, so that the Holy Spirit was "poured out" upon Paul equally as upon others; he received the "baptism" of the Spirit equally with all other members of the one body of Christ; he was made to drink of one Spirit alike with all other believers, yet when we turn to the record of the fact, we find, as formerly

remarked, no extraordinary manifestations such as occurred on Pentecost, but are simply informed that Ananias was sent to lay his hands on him that he might "be filled with the Holy Spirit."

Christianity has no theatricals, either public or private. It does nothing merely for display, and when it employs "signs and wonders," it is for just and sufficient reasons, and for a definite purpose. The concomitants of the giving of the Spirit on Pentecost, in Samaria, and elsewhere, were appropriate to the circumstances, and served to confirm the Word of the apostles and evangelists who preached to the people. In Paul's case, there was no necessity for such demonstrations, and they were not given. Yet Paul received "the gift of the Spirit" as fully as any one on Pentecost. No "cloven tongues like as of fire" were seen, but he received most richly the gift of tongues, as he says to the Corinthians, who, we are told, came behind the other churches in no gift, that he spoke with tongues more than all of them; and he enjoyed likewise, in the highest degree, all the miraculous powers, Divine visions, and inspirations. It is only by thus separating the accessories and accidents from the impartation of the Spirit himself, and contemplating this, in its reality and its simplicity, as the fulfillment of the Divine promise, that any just or consistent or enlarged views of this most important subject can be attained, and, it may be added, that it is a subject which, more than any other, involves, in its correct understanding, the right interpretation of the New Testament.

I have thus dwelt, somewhat at length, upon these figures, because they have been the occasion of much confusion of thought and religious error, especially as it relates to the question of the nature of the act indicated by the term baptism,\* and also continue to be grossly misapplied by theorists on the subject of "spiritual operations." Men's imaginations are inflamed with glowing pictures of the supernatural accompaniments of the first descent of the Spirit,

---

\* Anti-immersionists have sought, in the metaphorical language employed in relation to the descent of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, some support for their views, and some are bold to assert that God's way of baptizing on that occasion was by "pouring," and that this settles the question. They do not seem to perceive that a literal immersion *could* be the immediate and natural effect of an abundant outpouring from above, or that the cardinal idea in an immersion, an *overwhelming*, *would be a necessary* result of such an outpouring. If they have decided that "pouring," at least, has Divine authority, it is to be hoped that they will henceforth abandon, as a mode of baptism, the practice of "*sprinkling*." Nevertheless, it might be freely admitted that both "pouring" and "sprinkling" may be "modes of baptism," if the pouring or sprinkling be *copious enough or continued long enough* to effect the *immersion* or "overwhelming" of the "candidate." It will surely, however, be found more convenient to baptise by plunging the believer into water, than to accomplish his immersion by the more tedious process of either "pouring" or "sprinkling."

The attempt, above mentioned, to settle the *literal* meaning of a word by means of its *figurative* use, is so absurd, as scarcely to merit serious attention. On such a principle of interpretation, it is not the "word of God" that is a "lamp," but a "lamp" that is the "word of God;" it is not "Christ" who is the "bright morning star," but it is the "morning star" that is "Christ." Such efforts to evade the truth, in violation of the established laws of language, only betray the weakness of the cause in which they are employed, and the blindness induced by the prejudices of education.



and they are taught to look still for "Pentecostal seasons;" for stupendous miraculous displays; for "blood and fire and vapor of smoke," and for sights and sounds and visions of Christ, and whatever else of the marvelous may be gathered from the Oriental imagery of the prophets, while at the same time, and as an inevitable consequence, they are led to disparage the word of salvation which is nigh them, and to neglect the institutions and means of grace through which God bestows the blessings of the gospel.

Sufficient evidence, I trust, has now been adduced to show that such phrases as "outpouring of the Spirit," "baptism in the Spirit," etc., are just as applicable to believers now as they were in apostolic days, since these expressions are mere metaphors designed to express the simple literal fact of the gift of the Spirit—the Comforter or Paraclete who was to abide with the church forever. It is in this view alone, that a peculiar appropriateness appears in the particular designation of Christ as "he that baptiseth in the Holy Spirit." This was, and is, and will continue to be his special office. It is he who received of the Father the promised Spirit. The Spirit of God is the Spirit of Christ. And it is Christ who bestows this gift upon the believer as the efficient agent in his sanctification, and the earnest of his eternal inheritance. From the very necessity of the case, and in entire harmony with the most explicit declarations of Scripture, this gift must continue to be bestowed to the end of the world, and "He that baptizeth in the Holy Spirit" shall not have com-

pleted this important function until he shall be recognized as "He that cometh." The vain reasoning of those who, confounding miraculous powers which existed under all dispensations, with that gift of the Spirit which is the peculiar characteristic of the economy of the gospel, suppose this gift to have ceased because these powers have disappeared, scarcely merit attention, opposed as they are to the plainest teachings of the Word of God already adduced, and to the experience of every true believer. To profess a religion devoid of the Spirit of Christ, is to have "a form of godliness without the power thereof," and to substitute sheer rationalism, or its religious equivalent, Socinianism, for the Christianity of the Bible.

## CHAPTER VII.

The Kingdom of Heaven—Its nature and design—Supernatural powers in the Primitive Church—Paul's reasoning in regard to them—Test of Discipleship—Martyrdom—Spiritual gifts—Their purposes—Miraculous Faith—The human Will—Spiritual Gifts to be distinguished from the Permanent Fruits of the Spirit.

ONE of the most striking features of human nature is the love of the marvelous, the desire for something new and startling. Especially in relation to the things of the unseen spiritual world, and the mysteries of the religious life, do men "desire a sign," and seek after sensible proofs and external manifestations. But "the kingdom of heaven cometh not with observation." It is, in its essential nature, "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit," and men need to close their eyes upon the things of sense—to die to the world and to "be born again," before they can "see" this kingdom or realize and enjoy its blessings. It is here that the flesh "profits nothing," can originate nothing, can perfect nothing. It was indicative of the nature of this kingdom that its fundamental truth was not revealed to Peter "by flesh and blood," but by the "Father who is in heaven." For it is not a kingdom of this world, and this world can not supply its

principles, or aid its purposes, or furnish its regulations. It is truly the kingdom of heaven ; its Ruler is " the Lord from heaven," and men must be " born from above " before they can enter its sacred precincts.

This kingdom, nevertheless, is set up on the earth. It is designed to gather into it the children of men, that they may enjoy its blessings. Its Ruler, hence, though the Son of God, was also the son of man ; though " the Lord from heaven," he was also allied to the noblest of the royal families of earth, and entitled to reign both on earth and in heaven. The Word, though Divine, was made flesh and dwelt among men, that, partaking with them of flesh and blood, and " found in fashion as a man," he might reveal himself to men, and through death destroy, for them, him that had the power of death, and redeem humanity from the thralldom of sin and Satan. From the very nature of the case, therefore, his kingdom, though itself unseen, required to be introduced to the notice of mankind by means of sensible evidences through which alone it could be revealed to them. These evidences were accordingly furnished. Men were enabled to behold " the glory of the Only Begotten of the Father full of grace and truth : " their eyes were permitted to see and their hands to handle that " Word of life " which was manifested to the world, and all necessary proofs of his Divine character and mission were afforded in signs and wonders and mighty deeds. These demonstrations, however, when their purpose was attained, were necessarily with-

drawn, and the King himself, having gained the victory over our spiritual enemies, and "brought life and immortality to light," returned in triumph to the heavens to await the hour of the manifestation of the sons of God in the glory of the kingdom. He hence said to the disciples: "I came forth from the Father and am come into the world: again, I leave the world and go unto the Father." "It is expedient for you that I go away." It was proper that his personal presence in the flesh, should give place to one more consonant with the nature and genius of his reign; that sensible demonstration should no longer delay the work of faith; and that the earthly ties of Jewish relationship, and hopes of earthly grandeur, and fleshly feelings of natural attachment on the part of his disciples, should be merged in that higher and holier spiritual unity to be established by the Comforter. Hence, though they had known Christ after the flesh, they were to know him so no more; and though signs and wonders and supernatural manifestations for a time continued, as needed testimonials of the mission of the apostles, and as aids in the organization and development of the church, all these attestations and revelations were completed with the ministry of those whom Christ had constituted his ambassadors to the world, and with that immaturity of the church by which they were demanded.

While the church was thus in its pupilage, the special spiritual gifts needed for its edification and growth were conferred upon particular members for the benefit of the whole. Under these circumstances,

the love of novelty and of distinction, so characteristic of human nature, led some to desire the more showy and striking gifts, and to disparage those which, though less imposing, were of far more practical utility. The Corinthians, particularly, in their admiration of powers of language and of eloquence, seem to have chiefly prized the gift of tongues, and to have fallen into some disorder in their public meetings from their eagerness to display their gifts. Paul, in his first letter to them, thought it necessary, therefore, to give them special instructions on the subject, to which we shall now attend, in order to determine the precise position which supernatural powers occupy, as respects the promise and work of the Comforter.

In the beginning of the twelfth chapter, the apostle, after expressing his desire that the Corinthian brethren should understand this matter, and reminding them that they had formerly been carried away to dumb idols, who could reveal nothing and impart nothing, goes on to lay down two universal propositions: 1st. That "no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed;" and, 2d. That "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Spirit." As this passage has received various interpretations, it merits a somewhat careful consideration. In the first of these declarations, Paul is supposed by many to refer to the Jewish exorcists and others who were wont to invoke imprecations upon the name of Christ and upon his followers. In the second, he is thought to speak of conversion,

and, as some imagine, to affirm that faith is produced by a direct operation of the Spirit, or, as others think, by the testimony which the Spirit has provided in the word of God. It is difficult to see why the apostle should here refer to those who were not members of the church at all, or to the method by which persons became members, when his special subject was those spiritual gifts possessed by the *church itself*. A reference to the behavior of Jewish exorcists, or to the means of faith, would surely seem altogether irrelevant, and without any bearing or application in relation to the matter of which he treats. His expressed purpose in this portion of the epistle, is to instruct the church in regard to "spiritual gifts," and it is his evident aim to correct the notions of the Corinthians on that subject, by showing them that all these gifts, however various, were bestowed by "one and the self-same spirit," and were not for personal or individual distinction, but for the benefit of the entire church. He therefore compares the church to a body, whose members exercise each a different office; and shows that even the weakest or most uncomely of these, is necessary for the well-being of the whole, so that no one had occasion to glory in the particular function assigned to him, or to esteem himself more highly honored than others who fulfilled offices less prominent or distinguished.

It is in introducing this train of thought, that he lays down, in a very emphatic manner, the two general propositions above stated, both of which have a direct bearing upon the question of the *possession* of

the "one Spirit" by which the unity, the mutual sympathy and interdependence of the entire body are maintained. "No man," he says, "speaking by the Spirit, calleth Jesus accursed (anathema)," and, "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Spirit."

It should be observed that these propositions are not merely private judgments or conclusions entertained. They are not matters simply *believed*, for it is not said, 'no man taught by the Spirit, *believeth* Jesus accursed,' or 'no man can *believe* that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Spirit,' as the passage is usually understood; but 'no man by the Spirit *calleth* Jesus anathema;' "no man can *say* that Jesus is the Lord," etc. They must be understood, therefore, as being *public and formal declarations*, given under such circumstances as to render them, in a special manner, *tests* of the position occupied by him who uttered them. It is of course implied, in both cases, that these *statements* proceed from the real convictions of the persons uttering them. It is not, however, the entertaining them, but the *uttering* of them, that is here the distinguishing test; and it does not seem difficult to determine what was the particular *case* before the mind of the apostle here, if we for a moment consider the circumstances then surrounding the disciples. It is well known that they were at this time greatly persecuted, especially by the Jews, and that, when arraigned for judgment, opportunity was given them either to deny or to confess Christ. If any one, arrested as a disciple, was willing to repeat the usual



formula, "Jesus anathema," he was released, but all who would say that "Jesus is the Lord" were condemned. Here, then, was a public test of fealty to Christ with which all were then familiar, and it would seem to me to be the most natural view, to regard this as here directly alluded to, as these two public declarations are here contrasted with each other, and made, in the two cases, a test of the absence or presence of the Holy Spirit; it being affirmed that if any one under such circumstances, in immediate peril of life, could say that Jesus is the Lord, it was a proof that he did so by the aid of the Spirit of God dwelling in him, and imparting to him the strength and fortitude necessary to brave the pains of martyrdom. On the other hand, the individual who would then comply with the demand to say "Jesus anathema," gave evidence that he was destitute of the Spirit—an unbeliever, and, if numbered with the disciples, a hypocrite—one who, like Ananias and Sapphira, had united with them from false motives. The bearing, then, of this contrast upon the argument of the apostle would be this, to teach the Corinthians that there were proofs of the possession of the Holy Spirit other than those afforded by supernatural gifts, and that in fact any one, even though without a special charism, who was able to confess Christ before his persecutors, gave sufficient evidence by this that he possessed that "one Spirit," and was therefore entitled to recognition as a member of the "one body."

Unless this view be taken, the introduction of the

expression here, "Jesus anathema," would seem strange and inexplicable, and its relation to the subject altogether obscure. Nor would the confession of Christ, with which it is contrasted, if supposed the mere ordinary acknowledgment of his Messiahship, made by all seeming converts, be placed in so determinate a position as to justify Paul's language concerning it. The case supposed, however, was one probably never absent from the mind of Paul. He could himself recall many instances of the kind, for he had been himself a persecutor and had made havoc of the church, "delivering unto prisons and to death both men and women," destroying them who called on the name of Jesus, and compelling others, as he says, "to blaspheme"—to curse or anathematize Christ. To him such cases were familiar, and it would certainly be entirely natural that he should refer to them as tests of the absence or presence and power of that Divine Spirit, to which alone the strength to glorify Christ by martyrdom could be fairly attributed. It is true that the power to condemn death may be given by the intoxication of an enthusiasm which does not allow men to reflect, or by an apathy equally destitute of reason, but such cases are comparatively rare in the ordinary walks of life, and hardly supposable under the profession of the gospel in primitive times, enlightened and brought face to face, as the disciples then were, with the realities of the present and of the future life. It was their wont, therefore, always to recognize, in the calmness and steady purpose of the martyr, the immediate power of God. It is worthy

of notice, that at the death of Stephen, when they "gnashed on him with their teeth" and prepared to stone him, it is said, "But he, being full of the Holy Spirit, looked up steadfastly into heaven and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God." It had been said of him, on a former occasion, when he was selected to office, that he was "full of the Holy Spirit," and here, at this eventful moment, the statement is repeated, certainly for an important reason, since it is this alone which can serve to account for the glorious vision\* by which his soul was strengthened for a cruel death, amidst whose pains his last accents besought forgiveness for his murderers.

It is not at all surprising that the early Christians, impressed with the assurance of the Divine presence, and of special power to lay down their lives for Christ, were often led to offer themselves voluntarily to their persecutors, and to hasten thus to the enjoyment of that blessedness which the gospel revealed, as reserved in heaven for the people of God. This ardor, however, was disapproved by the more considerate and thoughtful, as indicating a want of proper

---

\* It is by no means an unreasonable faith that, to this hour, the saints of God have vouchsafed to them, in their dying moments, similar bright and consoling visions of the glory of Christ, and of the blessedness prepared for them. There are on record many remarkable instances of this in the case of the dying who, in their last moments, when the spirit was almost freed from the darkness of its earthly tabernacle, seem to have gazed in transport upon the wonders of the spirit world, and to have passed away, while uttering the name of Jesus, or of the dear ones who seemed to await their coming.

submission to the Divine will, and of patient waiting for the Lord. Nevertheless, the fact reveals how common and how strong was the assurance of Divine support in the hour of trial.\*

Although the view of this passage here presented to the reader as probably the true one, seems to the writer to explain satisfactorily the reason of the contrast made by the apostle, it amounts to the same

\*It was this confidence that enabled the timid and shrinking female, when unable to debate with the philosophers who examined her, to say to them, "I can not argue with you, but I can die for Jesus."

"Cyprian, in his last letter, when in prospect of martyrdom, wrote thus to his church: Conformably to the doctrine you have received from me, according to the injunction of the Lord, dearest brethren, maintain quiet and let no one of you excite dissension among the brethren, or voluntarily give himself up to the heathen. When he is taken and delivered up, then he must speak; for in that case the Lord that dwelleth in us speaks by our mouth."—*Memorials of Christian Life*, p. 86.

"Perpetua's companion in suffering, Felicitas, was near her confinement, and had much to endure. A heathen slave said to her: 'If now you suffer such pain, how will you feel when you are exposed to the wild beasts which you made so light of, when you refused to sacrifice?' She answered, 'What I now suffer, I endure myself alone, but then another will be with me, who will suffer for me, because I also will suffer for him.'"—*Memorials of Christian Life*, p. 92.

Luther, doubtless from his own experience, well remarks to the same purpose, in speaking of the assurance of possessing the Holy Spirit. "In the time of tribulation, or of the cross and of the confession of our faith (which is the proper and principal work of those who believe), when we must forsake wife, children, goods, and life, or else deny Christ, then it appeareth that we make confession of our faith, that we confess Christ and his word, by the power of the Holy Spirit."—*Luther on Galatians*, p. 448.

thing, so far as the general argument is concerned, if the ability to say that Jesus is Lord, be regarded, apart from the supposed test, as belonging to all who had received the Holy Spirit. It is entirely proper to suppose that all who had truly believed, and had afterward received the Holy Spirit, and could therefore say "Abba, Father," would be ready to confess Christ, as martyrs, if arraigned in judgment; and Paul may be understood to affirm here merely that all who could thus truly call Jesus Lord, did so by the Spirit dwelling in them, and were hence at once to be recognized as members of the body of Christ, even if they possessed no special spiritual gift. It would seem, then, to be the object of the apostle, whichever view be taken, to teach the Corinthians, who were full of vain glory as to their spiritual gifts, that the possession of these was not at all needed to prove the indwelling of the Spirit, since even the humblest and weakest member who had received no power either to work a miracle, to speak with tongues, or to perform any other mighty work, gave, nevertheless, sufficient evidence that he had the Spirit of Christ, by his ability truly to acknowledge Jesus as Lord, in presence of those dangers which, at that time; rendered this public confession a constant and sufficient test of discipleship. Having made this general statement, the apostle now goes on to speak of the particular gifts or charisms conferred upon the Church, declaring that there were "different gifts" but "the same Spirit;" "different administrations but the same Lord," and "diversi-

ties of operations," but "the same God which worketh all in all," particularizing thus the three Divine manifestations, and at the same time maintaining the Divine unity in the declaration, "it is the same God which worketh all in all." \*

As it would not be conducive to the main purpose of this treatise to enter upon a particular consideration of the "spiritual gifts" of the primitive church,

---

\* We may note here, that Paul in the beginning makes thus a three-fold division of the spiritual endowments (πνευματικῶν) of which he treats in this chapter. This division is into—1. Charisms (χαρισμάτα, free or special gifts); 2. Administrations (διάκονια, ministries); and 3. Operations (ἐνεργήματα, inworkings). The first seems to include those limited and particular gifts, conferred for congregational benefit. Timothy had a special gift of this kind conferred upon him (1 Tim. iv: 14; 2 Tim. i: 6), and was exhorted to exercise it. The second comprehended a wider or higher class—"administrations;" that is, spiritual services and capacities of an *official* nature. Thus, for these, it is said (Eph. iv: 12), "he gave apostles, prophets, pastors and teachers." So in Col. iv: 17: "Say to Archippus, Take heed to the *ministry* which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfill it." In 1 Tim. i: 12, Paul says: "He counted me faithful, putting me into the *ministry*." The third class embraces "inworkings"—connected in verse 10 with "powers" (δυνάμειν)—rendered "working of miracles," but to be taken in a more general sense, as referring to all supernatural internal energies communicated—the impulse—the faith as well as the power. In the 6th verse, these are attributed to God; and in the 11th, it is said of all these different endowments: "All these worketh (ἐνεργεῖ, inworketh) that one and the self-same Spirit dividing to every man severally as he will," the manifestation (φανέρωσις) of the Spirit being given to every man [or in all cases] for the "profit" or advantage of the whole body. The Spirit is here represented as 'dividing as *he wills*.' Personality is thus clearly ascribed to him. Again, these "inworkings," in the 6th verse ascribed to God, are, in the 11th, ascribed to the Spirit, thus involving Divinity.

some of the facts relating to them will here alone be stated. These gifts, together with the circumstances which required them, have long since passed away, and the true nature of many of them remains unknown, and probably could be made known by nothing short of a practical exemplification. As this is no longer possible, any labored effort to define them accurately or to explain them intelligibly, would be unprofitable. A few general conclusions only may with certainty be deduced from the accounts we have of them.

1. *The special "gifts" (χαρίσματα, charisms, spiritual endowments) in each congregation, as well as the inspired official persons furnished in primitive times, were designed for the confirmation and full development of the gosp'l.* For this end, persons called apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, etc., were provided and supernaturally qualified, and exercised accordingly their various gifts, whether these related to the instruction of the Church, and to its social life and duties, or to the conversion of the world. Each congregation was evidently furnished, to a greater or less extent, with special functionaries, who were enabled to fulfill their duties by immediate illumination from the Spirit. The Church is, hence, repeatedly compared to a body possessing many members, each fulfilling a different office, but all required for the growth and perfection of the whole. Rom. xii: 4-8; 1 Cor. xii: 12-30.

2. *These gifts were to be exercised, not beyond, 'but according to the ability which God gave.'* 1 Peter iv:

II. That is, persons inspired were not to allow themselves to be carried away by excitement, so as to be in danger of mistaking the imaginations of their own hearts for the revelations of the Spirit, or of mingling these together. Of this there seems to have been danger, so mysterious, and in many respects so similar, are the workings of the Divine Spirit and of the human spirit, man having been, as to his spiritual nature, created in the image of God. Hence, there seems to have been imparted, in many cases at least, a special consciousness or assurance, termed "faith," which was not the faith of justification, but a peculiar felt confidence in the possession of Divine power, beyond which it was not proper to attempt the exercise of any gift. This "faith," Paul (1 Cor. xii: 9) speaks of as a special endowment, and his language seems to imply that it was not bestowed upon all, as indeed it may not have been needed in regard to every charism. In the more important ones, especially such as had respect to the presentation of Divine truth by inspiration, it was doubtless most important. Thus Paul himself is particular to distinguish between the conclusions of his own mind and the direct revelations of the Spirit (1 Cor. vii: 6, 10, 12, 40), and, in regard to some required regulations, he even invokes the concurrence of the human judgment (1 Cor. x: 15; xi: 13, etc.), thus, at the same moment, marking the distinction as well as the consentaneity between the Divine and the human spirit. In regard to this peculiar "faith," he says (Rom. xii: 6): "Having, then, gifts differing



according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith," etc. Hence the need of the apostolic warning to every one who possessed a charism, "not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think"—that is, not to overrate the degree of spiritual insight or other supernatural power imparted to him, but to estimate himself *in this respect* wisely and reasonably, "according as God has dealt to every man the [measure or] proportion of faith." Rom. xii: 3. The measure of this peculiar "faith," then, indicated precisely the extent to which the "charism" reached; just as "the measure of the gift of Christ" (Eph. iv: 7) was that of the grace by which it had been bestowed or by which it was attended.

This special "faith," connected with the exercise of the Spiritual gifts, has sometimes been confounded with the ordinary faith of the gospel. Its general nature as faith, trust, confidence, was undoubtedly the same, and it has been hence difficult to make the proper distinction. It differed, however, in that it was a special and direct gift independent of external testimony, and seems to have been a special power or ability to apply, in the exercise of miraculous power, that confidence in God which must be the true basis of every religious act. "Faith's great work," the sainted Leighton well observes, "is to renounce self-power, and to bring in the power of God to be ours." It is easy to perceive how great the danger of error and failure here, when men were endowed with *supernatural* gifts, and how readily human vanity might



ensnare the possessor. Hence, the need of some specific internal guide or standard, equally direct and Divine as the Spiritual gift itself, and immediately associated with the exercise of this gift, both as limiting its extent and indicating its source. The disciples, (Mark ix: 18,) attempted to cast out a demon, but were unable to do so. Their faith had been to some extent, at least, replaced by reliance on themselves. Christ expressly attributed their failure to want of faith, and of that prayerfulness and seeking after God, through which, both the faith and the power to perform the miracle would doubtless have been given. The Divine impulse to work any miracle or deliver any revelation, was thus to be attended by a present consciousness of Divine power to do it, beyond which, the individual was not at liberty to go. This power was thus distinguishable from any mere human ability. "Why look ye so earnestly on us," said Peter in the temple porch, "as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk?" Acts iii: 12. In like manner, this "faith" to work miracles was distinguishable from the faith of justification. A man might be furnished with this faith and the accompanying power "to remove mountains," and yet, if devoid of love, be as "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." But true justifying faith can have no existence apart from that love through which alone it works and is perfected.

3. *The person possessing spiritual gifts had a certain control over them.* Inspiration, for instance, was not an ungovernable "afflatus" or ecstasy, like that of

the Pythia on her tripod, or the ravings of other heathen hierophants. "The spirits of the prophets," says Paul, "are subject to the prophets," and hence it was in the power of the inspired person to repress the exercise of his gift and even to "quench the Spirit," 1 Thess. v: 19; or, on the other hand, to regulate the manifestation of the supernatural powers conferred, in conformity with the instructions of one more highly endowed. Thus Paul: "Let the prophets speak, two or three, and let the other judge. If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace. For ye may all prophesy one by one," etc. 1 Cor. xiv: 29-31. The reason given for these regulations is, that peace may be preserved and confusion avoided. The existence of this power furnishes a striking proof of the care taken to leave the human *will* supreme and free, since thus only could man continue to be a moral agent, accountable for the use made of his privileges, faculties, and gifts. The same observation may be made also, in relation to the indwelling Holy Spirit himself, apart from any special charism, that the human will was still left free to determine, in the last resort, for itself, however it might be instructed and prompted by the Spirit. It was thus always possible to refuse consent to his monitions, impulses, or pleadings, and to so prefer to "walk under the flesh," and "turn aside from the holy commandment" given, as to "grieve the Holy Spirit" and occasion his withdrawal. Heb. vi: 4-6.\*

---

\* In the case of a person possessed by a demon, the latter seems to

As the Spirit employed the bodily organs of speech, there is no room to doubt that he made use also of the mental acquirements and moral characteristics, peculiar to each individual, bringing these into natural action, while imparting at the same time supernatural illumination or guidance. The manifestation of the gift, accordingly, so far as manner, style of language, etc., were concerned, would necessarily blend, with the substance of the Divine communication, more or less of the individuality of the speaker or writer, as is found to be the case in the evangelistic and apostolic writings. As there was thus a conjoint and synchronous action of the human and Divine spirits, it is easy to conceive that the human faculties, whether of mind or body, were still allowed to remain under the final control of the human will; and that there was hence the utmost pertinency in the instructions of the apostles, as to the exercising of these gifts in an orderly and edifying manner. It was *possible*, as well as *proper*, for one prophet to be silent, when some-

---

have been allowed to have control of the human will, or at least so to divide with it the rule of the being, as to create a state of inexpressible torment and constant warfare. It is difficult to conceive of a more terrible condition than this, when the spirit of man is dethroned, and a malignant emissary of Satan is permitted to maintain unending conflict amidst the powers of the inner nature, and to array, as in *delirium tremens*, in the very penetralia of the soul, specters more fearful than "fables yet have feigned or fear conceived"—to afflict the body with disease and the soul with spiritual pollution! Such a condition might be conceived as permitted, in consequence of habitual sin—a constant yielding to temptation—a seeking after and encouraging the spirit of evil.

thing was revealed to another sitting by, which demanded utterance at that particular moment. It is evident, also, that the different gifts were called forth as the circumstances and the occasion required, and that proper attention was to be paid to the dictations and promptings of the Spirit through different minds.\*

Upon the whole, then, it may be observed, that the

---

\* Many vain attempts have been made, to fix and define the nature of the supernatural operations of the Spirit. Some look upon them as simply "mechanical," a mere temporary moving of the natural powers, aided for the time. Others regard them as "organical" or "dynamical," as animating and vivifying the "spiritual faculty" in man, and heightening its energy and capacity. But little if any benefit, however, can arise from such efforts, though they may amuse the mind or fill it with the notion of superior knowledge. Words of "learned length," such as "mechanical," "organical," "dynamical," really explain nothing and reveal nothing, though they may be sufficiently convenient in our classifications. We know really nothing of the essential nature of that power which the human spirit exerts, and often at the same time, upon the intellectual, the moral, and the physical organisms. As to the nature of the miraculous power which the Spirit of God has exerted or may exert, it is just as inexplicable as creation itself to the human intellect.

One thing is worthy of notice, that there seems to be a singular connection between a peculiar *exalted state of feeling* and Divine communications. The mind would appear to be sometimes in an unfit state to be acted on, and needing to be attuned or brought into harmonious relation with the things to be revealed, before it can receive or deliver them. The effect of *music* in creating or bringing about this softened or receptive state of mind and feeling is remarkable. It was employed for this very purpose by Elisha, 2 Kings iii: 15. Its power over the spiritual nature is illustrated also in the case of Saul, king of Israel. David's love of music, and his exercise of the gift, had, doubtless, much to do with the production of the Psalms.

“spiritual gifts” were designed for the “profit” or benefit of the church, as the functions of the eye or the ear are intended, not for itself alone, but for the body. They were given and distributed, as the Holy Spirit pleased, for general edification, and are to be distinguished from the indwelling of the Spirit himself, as the human spirit is to be distinguished from any of the organs through which it works. A spiritual gift could, it seems, be conferred directly, or by the laying on of the hands of those officially authorized, and it might be imparted to one already in possession of the Spirit of adoption; or, on the other hand, to one who did not possess this. In other words, these gifts, though imparted by the Spirit, are to be distinguished from that indwelling presence of the Spirit which was common to all Christians, and to which these gifts might be super-added, or from which they might be subtracted, without at all affecting the permanent and essential work and office of the Comforter. The Spirit of God could employ any agency suited to his purpose, whether intellectual, moral, or physical, quite independently of his abiding as the Paraclete in the agent so employed. Hence, the possession of a charism in no case necessarily involved sanctifying power, or a state of sanctification and acceptance with God. The Spirit had imparted miraculous powers in all ages, and to various descriptions of persons and things—to Moses and to Moses’ rod, to the living Elisha as well as to his bones. It had spoken by Balaam and by Balaam’s ass, and wrought

miracles as well by Judas Iscariot \* as by James or John; and as readily by the shadow of Peter, or by handkerchiefs from Paul, as by their actual presence. Persons possessing supernatural powers, in all ages, are to be contemplated merely as agents or agencies through which the Spirit operated, and these powers are to be regarded as entirely distinguishable and separable from that indwelling presence of the Spirit, which is the characteristic of the Christian Institution; by which believers were "sealed to the day of redemption," and a Divine unity established in the body of Christ.

Hence, though one were gifted with the tongues of men and of angels, and had the power of prophecy, and understood all mysteries and all knowledge, and had the gift of faith to remove mountains, he might yet be, so far as concerned the conditions of salvation, as mere sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal, being without the justification which is by faith, as formerly remarked. It were impossible that this could be his state, if the mere possession of these powers implied necessarily the indwelling of the Spirit. These manifestations were for a limited time, and for temporary purposes only, as Paul expressly declares, 1 Cor. xiv: 8: "Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." But there was to be no termination or cessation in regard to those "fruits of

---

\* Compare Luke vi: 13, with ix: 1.

the Spirit" which appertained to the moral and religious life, and which, in 1 Cor. xiv, the apostle engrosses under the comprehensive term "love,"\* as truly characteristic manifestations of the Spirit of the New Institution, and proofs of that Divine unity, that "abiding" in Christ, without which these fruits could not appear. For love is the great motive power which the Holy Spirit sheds abroad in the heart. "The love of God," says Paul, "is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit given unto us;" that is, the Holy Spirit sheds abroad in the heart *God's love to us in Christ*, creating and maintaining thereby our love to him, and thus assuring the observance of his commandments. Hence it

---

\* Thus, in the description of the effects of charity or love, it will be seen that Paul embraces long-suffering, gentleness, meekness, temperance, patience, etc., qualities which, in Gal. v: 22, 23, he enumerates, apart from love, under their distinctive names. In Corinthians, he contemplates love as really comprehending in itself all Christian graces. In Galatians, he presents them in connection with love, but apart, and as equally fruits of the Spirit. Thus he here gives "faith" as one of the fruits of the Spirit, while, in 1 Cor. xiv: 7, he describes "love" as "believing all things." This is a beautiful representation of the state of mind produced by love, for when any one is greatly loved, he is readily trusted. Love gives such a preparation of heart, that we implicitly receive whatever is related to us, just as the child receives from its mother the lessons of the nursery with equal confidence, whether these be fanciful or true. Where, in Galatians v: 23, faith is given as one of the fruits of the Spirit, the proper rendering would be *trustfulness*—i. e., that recipient condition of mind which results from love. It should be noted here that, in this enumeration, "love" is mentioned first and placed at the head of the list, as the most important, being, indeed, the source of all the rest.



may comprehensively include every active attribute of character appertaining to the Christian life in the world, and be justly regarded as "the fulfilling of the law," the "end of the commandment," the aim of the practical teaching of the gospel. This, however, could not be affirmed of the spiritual gifts imparted to the Church, the exercise of which, so far from producing love, seems, through the fallibility of human nature, to have tended to confusion and discord; and the possession of which led to self-glorification and pride. 1 Cor. viii: 1-3; xiv: 23-32. These gifts were bestowed during the *childhood* of the Church, to supply the instruction and intellectual guidance needed, until 'all should come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.' This knowledge and guidance, given in appropriate lessons as circumstances required, and reflected from many minds, like light from the polished facets of a globe, illuminated and cheered, but it was love alone which, resting on faith, and animated by hope, could permanently build up and establish the church of the Living God. 1 Cor. viii: 1.

## CHAPTER VIII.

Manifestations of the Spirit prior to Pentecost—Compared with Miraculous Powers of Apostolic Age—Differ from the Gift of the Holy Spirit—Speculation and Sensuism—Different Dispensations of Religion—Position of the People of God under the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Institutions.

**I**T is from the point of view afforded by the supernatural powers and revelations imparted under the personal ministry of Christ and the apostles, that we may best contemplate the manifestations of the Spirit recorded in the Old Testament. When thus regarded, they appear to be evidently of the same nature. The Old Testament saints, Christ's personal followers and the spiritually gifted individuals of the primitive church, as such, seem to have occupied precisely the same position in relation to the *Paraclete* of the New Institution, however great or different in other respects their privileges and blessings. That is to say, none of them can be considered as having, by virtue of their special gifts, received the promised Comforter, though all alike possessed supernatural powers, or received direct Divine communications.

The common view, I am aware, is, that the patriarchs and eminent men who feared God in ancient times, were similarly situated with those who live

under the gospel dispensation, as to all essential religious blessings. It is supposed that they enjoyed, by anticipation, the indwelling presence of the Spirit, since, apart from the circumstances and institutions under which they lived, they had attained to faith in God; "walked with God;" were obedient to his commandments, and received manifold tokens of the Divine favor in special communications and deliverances. As the presence of the Comforter is admitted to be essential *now* to the assurance and enjoyment of the favor of God, it is taken for granted that it was essential *in all ages*, and that, hence, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Elijah and all the ancient saints, possessed the Spirit of God, or Holy Spirit, in the same sense as Christians after Pentecost. The promise of the Spirit, it is indeed admitted, did not belong to the dispensations under which the patriarchs lived, but irrespective of these institutions, and, as it were, in advance of them, it is supposed that the ancient saints had attained to that sincere and perfect faith and preparation of heart which, under the New Institution, is the only prerequisite to the reception of the Holy Spirit, and that they, consequently, enjoyed its blessings. It must be acknowledged that this view is one easily gathered from a cursory survey of the subject, and that it is not devoid of plausibility and apparent consistency. It is, hence, very generally entertained. It seems, nevertheless, to the writer, to be incompatible with the teachings of Scripture, and to have been adopted by way of relief from a perplexing and difficult question, rather than from careful inquiry and due

reflection upon the state of mankind at different periods and under different religious systems. It will, therefore, be expedient to give to this question a candid and somewhat full consideration.

As said before, the term "Spirit," where the reference is to the "Spirit of God," occurs comparatively but seldom in the Old Testament. "Holy Spirit" is found but twice (Ps. li: 11, and Isa. lxiii: 10). The whole of the Old Testament shows that the idea of the Spirit, as revealed in the New Testament, was but dimly apprehended under former dispensations. Nevertheless, the divine nature of the Spirit, and his unity with God, are clearly shown. The Spirit is revealed as incubating the waters from which the earth proceeded. It appears, if the common interpretation be correct, as striving with men in their apostasy (Gen. vi: 3); as endowing with prophetic power God's chosen ministers of warning and deliverance, and as confirming often their mission by miraculous powers. He gave signs and wonders to be performed by Moses; he imparted unwonted mechanical skill to Bezaleel, Aholiab, and others (Ex. xxviii: 3; xxxi: 2-6; xxxv: 31); physical strength to Sampson; wisdom to Solomon; inspiration and power to Elijah and the prophets, down to the close of the Old Testament canon—through a period much longer than that in which such gifts continued in the Christian Church. It is to be remarked, however, that, in all these cases in which the Spirit is declared, or may be regarded, as the agent, the effects attributed are supernatural and quite aside from the ordinary

course of things, and that, in none of them, is there any indication of the impartation of the Spirit, as the spirit of adoption and of love, to control the moral and religious nature. David, indeed, says, "Quicken me with thy free Spirit," and again, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me;" but David was an inspired prophet and poet, and might well employ such expressions in reference to the enrapturing visions and divine illuminations which he enjoyed as a prophet, without the slightest allusion, unless a merely typical one, to the Holy Spirit of the New Institution. Throughout the ancient biblical records, indeed, the manifestations of the Spirit are constantly for the accomplishment of purposes of a special, extraordinary, and generally temporary nature—as in the deliverance of Israel from bondage, and in the establishment and occasional restoration of the Jewish theocracy.

When these manifestations are compared with those signs and wonders which attended the introduction and development of the gospel, they appear to be plainly of the same nature. They were all equally direct operations of the Spirit, supernatural, special, and transient. The possession or exercise of these powers neither required holiness on the part of the agent, nor did it appear to have any tendency to produce it, as may be seen as well in the case of Balaam as in that of Judas Iscariot, or even in that of other disciples, who, upon their return from the performance of miracles, needed the admonitions of their Master to repress their pride. Luke x: 20. These

powers, like all the charisms of the Christian church, were thus quite independent of that indwelling of the Spirit which was the peculiar feature of the New Institution, and the earnest of an eternal inheritance. They were temporary; this was to abide forever. They were endowments imparted to the physical or intellectual natures; this was a gift bestowed upon the heart. They were fragmentary, partial, and fitful; but this, complete, universal, and permanent. The miraculous powers, indeed, seem to have had no particular connection with the proper "gift of the Spirit," except that on Pentecost and some subsequent occasions, they were occasionally conferred *at the same time*, and were in themselves immediate manifestations of the Divine power and presence, for the special purpose of confirming the gospel. They were, undoubtedly, communicated by the Spirit of God, just as from the beginning, such powers had been communicated; but they did not establish, any more than in former times, those relations between the *person* of the believer and the Holy Spirit, which were to distinguish the gospel dispensation from every other. Those who possessed merely these powers could not be said to have received the Holy Spirit in the New Testament sense. They had received certain powers only, as Christ gave to his disciples 'power over unclean spirits, and to heal diseases.' In a certain sense, it could be said that the Spirit was "in" them, or "upon" them since, for the time, it exalted or superseded natural ability and worked through or by them in accomplishing its purposes, whether of illu-

mination or of confirmation, but it could not be said that they had received the Holy Spirit or the Paraclete, as that special manifestation or impartation which was peculiar to the Gospel Institution.

This distinction between the indwelling of the Spirit himself, and the particular miraculous powers which he was pleased to confer upon individuals for certain purposes, is one of no little moment, however difficult of comprehension it may be, from the mystery which naturally appertains to the entire subject, as well as from the difficulty of expressing, in human speech, "those things of the Spirit" which may, nevertheless, be realized in human experience. The Spirit of God employs human language in order to reveal himself to us objectively, and he never becomes otherwise than objectively known to those who rest content with a superficial knowledge of words, and mistake mere ideas and definitions for realities.

In religious matters, it may be remarked, that men are prone to two different extremes or species of error, viz., speculation and sensuism—a vain and deceitful philosophy, or a gross materialism which would subject every thing to the judgment of the senses. In ancient times, the Greeks sought after "wisdom," and, in the middle ages, the schoolmen were captivated by the intellectual pleasure connected with a philosophy which still lingers in the so-called "Divinity" of modern days; but, in all ages, the errors of sensuism have been far more common with the mass of mankind. As the Jews sought after a sign, so it has been usual for men to exalt or exagger-

ate sensible demonstrations, so that the outward manifestations of the Spirit in supernatural works, have, hence, absorbed their attention and occupied their thoughts, as if these were primary or chief matters and the true and only evidences of the presence of the Spirit. Down even to modern times, the tendency is to seek in some feeling, some fancied unusual sight, or sound or vision, a sensible evidence, where the word of God alone should be heard, and faith only should be followed. Men, evermore, desire something that addresses itself to the physical rather than to the moral nature, and which, by reducing religion to some external form, or some momentary flash of superstitious wonderment, may serve them as a substitute for a self-denying obedience, and a renovation of the heart and life.

The state of the Jewish people, during our Lord's ministry, affords a clear illustration of this continual earthward tendency of human nature. So filled were they with worldly and selfish anticipations in regard to the Messiah's kingdom, that they were unable to recognize in the meek and lowly Saviour the Hope of Israel. Their hearts had become gross, their eyes were closed against the light, their ears were unable to hear the still small voice of truth. They came to Jesus not to receive instruction, but "desiring him that he would show them a sign from heaven." Giving no heed to the evidences before them, they could not discern "the signs of the times," though alert in material things to discern "the signs of the sky." The Great Teacher hence declared:



"A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given unto it but the sign of the prophet Jonas." It was not by external marvels, by might, or physical power, that men's souls were to be saved ; but by the love of God displayed in the redemptive work of Christ: His death for sin, his burial and his resurrection on the third day, typified in the deliverance of Jonah, were to constitute a "sign" which should be to the saved, the wisdom and the power of God in the soul. The gospel facts in their sublime simplicity, their immovable permanency, their far-reaching relations, were to be such a revelation of the love of God to the human heart, as to disarm its enmity, purify its affections, and establish therein, through the Holy Spirit, the righteousness, peace, and joy of the kingdom of heaven.

The Scribes and Pharisees, however, had neither eyes to see the spiritual realities of Christ's true kingdom, nor hearts to comprehend them. Hence it was, that the glowing oriental imagery of the prophets, no less than the parables of Jesus, served to blind and mislead them. Nor are there wanting to this hour, multitudes who, from a similar condition of mind, are unable to discriminate between the gift of the Paraclete on Pentecost and "those wonders in heaven above," those "signs on the earth beneath," the "blood and fire and vapor of smoke," by which, in prophetic imagery or in reality, this gift was heralded or accompanied. Confounding its accidents and concomitants with the gift itself, or regarding these as

inseparable and essential, they occupy themselves with those transient and external manifestations, which were specially appropriate when the apostles first stood up to preach the gospel to the world, and when a vision of separated fiery tongues was an apt and striking emblem of their mission, and a visible exhibition of their credentials. Modern enthusiasts ignorantly and presumptuously still pray, but always in vain, for "fire;" for visible tokens; for audible voices from the unseen; they still "seek after a sign," they still strive to bring Christ from above, or from beneath, in some tangible or sensible form, while, at the same time, they turn a deaf ear to the word that is "nigh" them, even to "the word of faith" preached by the apostles, which, to the believing heart, reveals, in all its spiritual power, the sign of Jonas the prophet.

It will be admitted, that the miracles wrought by the Spirit of God, in the time of the Jewish Institution, were decisive, stupendous, and wonderful. Those which were performed by the Saviour are declared to be greater still—more immediate and striking acts of Divine power. These miracles, performed during Christ's personal ministry, were certainly not inferior to those which occurred under the ministry of the apostles. Now, if the impartation of these powers is not to be distinguished from the gift of the Holy Spirit, then the day of Pentecost could no longer be that "great and notable day of the Lord," as declared by Joel and by Peter, upon which the outpouring of the Spirit was to take place. Things

as great and notable had been done before, so far as miracles were concerned. These had been common to all dispensations and ages. They had been especially and wonderfully displayed, during Christ's personal ministry, in the period immediately preceding the day of Pentecost, yet this was to be a "great and notable day;" distinguished from all others, foretold with special fervor by an ancient prophet, particularly indicated by Christ himself, and anxiously waited for by the apostles at Jerusalem. They were, then, not waiting merely for miraculous powers. These had been as fully displayed before. They had themselves previously possessed and exercised these. The "power" with which they were now to be endowed "from on high," was of a different nature, and hence it was, that while they could work no greater miracles than before, they were themselves *transformed* into different men, and became to the world living miracles, so to speak, of *moral* and *spiritual* power; of patient suffering; of faith; of knowledge; of purity; of humility and love.

In determining that miraculous power was a matter quite distinct from the bestowment of the "earnest of the Spirit" upon believers under the new covenant, we are not, however, left to reason from the general facts of Scripture. There are many direct and unequivocal evidences of this truth. For example: Christ, in his personal ministry, sent the twelve, by two and two, to preach the kingdom of God, and "gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases," (Luke ix: 1,) or as Matthew (x: 1, 8,) expresses it,

"gave them power against unclean spirits to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease." Again, on a subsequent occasion, he sent forth the seventy on a similar mission, and with similar powers, and so successful were they, that they exclaimed with joy, upon their return, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name." On this occasion, Jesus, before whose eyes the secrets of the spiritual world were constantly unveiled, assures them that he had himself seen "Satan as lightning fall from heaven," that this "Prince of the power of the air" had, indeed, been vanquished and dispossessed of the empire he had usurped over the bodies and souls of men. "Behold," says he, "I give you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall by any means hurt you." At the same time, he warns them, not to rejoice that the spirits were subject to them, but that their names were "written in heaven." He turns away their attention from manifestations of power, to a higher blessedness, and, rejoicing himself in spirit, in that revelation of the Father which he was empowered to make, he exclaims, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes." "All things," he adds, "are delivered to me of my Father, and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him." The time, indeed, for the fullness of this peculiar revelation had

not yet arrived. Its preliminary facts and truths and evidences, were only in process of development. The redemptive work must first be accomplished, and that knowledge of the Father and of the Son, here spoken of, was of necessity reserved to a later period. Even at the near approach of this appointed time, he says to the disciples: "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also." But he announces to them that he would send them another Comforter, and that, after the world for a little while should see him no more, he would come to them. "*At that day,*" said he, "you shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." And when the disciples asked how he would manifest himself to them and not unto the world, the reply was: "If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." John xiv: 23. An experimental knowledge of the Divine life, a participation in that mysterious spiritual unity which the gospel was to establish, could be effected only through the impartation of the Spirit, and God was to give his Holy Spirit, at the appointed time, only to those who would "obey him." Acts v: 32.

It is not, indeed, to be denied that the privileges and blessings enjoyed by the disciples during Christ's personal ministry were transcendently great. In respect to every thing that had preceded in the Divine communications with men, their opportunities and advantages were great beyond comparison. "Blessed," said Jesus to them, "are the eyes which see the things

that ye see, for I tell you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them, and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them." They enjoyed the precious privilege of seeing and hearing God manifest in the flesh, of beholding, with their natural eyes, the glory of the only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, and of hearing, with mortal human ears, the gracious words which fell from his lips. They were, moreover, the constant objects of his personal care and solicitude, his spiritual watchfulness and guidance. He was their *first* "Comforter," supporter, and loving Divine keeper and instructor. It is impossible to describe the charm of that mysterious attachment, which grew up in their simple natures, for one whom others rejected and despised, but who was to them more than father or mother, wife or children, houses or lands—for whom, indeed, they had forsaken all things, and in whom alone they had placed their hope and trust. No terms can portray the sweet enchantment of that affectionate intimacy; of that unreserved and unaffected candor; that guileless, yet wondering and not unquestioning reliance on the part of the disciples; much less can it depict that ineffable tenderness, sympathy and love, ever manifested by the Redeemer, for those whom he himself had chosen and ordained; for those whom the Father had given him out of the world. "Fear not," said he, "little flock; it is the Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." "Ye are they who have

continued with me in my tribulations." "The Father himself loveth you, because you have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God." He extenuated their faults, he enlightened their ignorance, he touchingly apprized them of his approaching sufferings and of his necessary departure, he soothed their apprehensions, he anticipated their dangers. He gathered them around him, at a final interview, and oh, wondrous example of humility and love! "poureth water into a basin and began to wash their feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded." And, finally, in anticipation of the unspeakable culmination of redeeming love, he administered to them the symbols of his own body and blood, soon to be given for them upon the cross of Calvary!

It is not, however, by the intimacy and the extent of those moral and spiritual relations which subsisted between Christ and his disciples, that the superficial and sensuous would estimate the privileges which the latter enjoyed, so much as by the striking fact that he shared with them his Divine *power*, and imparted to them authority over demons, and ability to cure by a touch all manner of diseases. Such outward proofs, appealing to the senses, demanding no spiritual discernment, enforcing no lessons of humility, but displaying the majesty and power of Deity before the world, have, as we have before observed, in all ages captivated the minds of men, and filled them with wonder and superstitious fear. These things, they are ready to say, are surely of God. These

powers demonstrate that those who exercise them possess the Spirit of God. Whatever may be said about an internal "witness," a "change of heart," a 'strengthening of the inner man,' here, at least, is something visible and tangible; here, at least, we may rest assured, is "the gift of the Holy Spirit."

It is dangerous, however, for poor fallible man,

"Most ignorant of what he's most assured,

to depend upon his own reasonings, especially in regard to the "things of the Spirit," since he is wholly dependent for his knowledge of these upon the revelations of the Spirit himself. *It is nowhere said in Scripture that the disciples received the Holy Spirit in the time of Christ's personal ministry.* It matters not, then, how highly we may estimate their privileges, or those mighty miraculous powers which were specially imparted to them; it is immaterial how we may accumulate them all in evidence; they do not, singly or collectively, afford any proof, in the absence of a Scripture declaration, that the Holy Spirit had been given to the disciples, or received by them. On the contrary, this is constantly spoken of as something yet future; as something that could not possibly occur until Christ himself should go away (John xvi: 7), and until that eventful day should arrive for which they waited at Jerusalem, in hope and prayer. Nay, this event is not only thus constantly referred to the period succeeding Christ's ministry, but it is most plainly and pointedly announced, in the very midst of all the powers and blessings which the disciples



enjoyed as personal followers of Christ, that THE HOLY SPIRIT WAS NOT YET GIVEN, BECAUSE THAT JESUS WAS NOT YET GLORIFIED. John vii: 39.

It was on the last day, that great day of the feast, that Jesus stood and revealed the far richer and nobler provision which God had furnished, in the spiritual Zion, for his believing people. He cried: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." "This," adds an infallible interpreter, writing near the close of the first century, "spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive." This gift was to be in the believer, as the Great Teacher elsewhere expresses it, "a well of water springing up unto everlasting life"—a perennial source of blessedness not only to the possessor, but copious streams—yea, rivers of living water—of spiritual blessedness flowing forth from him to others. The Spirit was to constitute, in the heart of the believer, an interior and unfailing source of that moral and spiritual power which was to overflow the nations and pervade the world, and purify, refresh, and renovate mankind down to the latest generations. This consisted not in any miraculous signs or prodigies, past, present, or to come. It was wholly independent and apart from all local, transient, and provisional circumstances and conditions. It stood forth alone, as the grand consummation of Christ's redemptive work on earth, the crowning joy of faith, the assurance of hope, the ever-abiding earnest of eternal glory. It

is announced here as a fact yet future, and the reason why it was necessarily yet future, is also given. "The Holy Spirit was not yet *given* because Jesus was not yet glorified." It was necessary that the sacrifice should be offered, and that the "High Priest of our profession" should ascend into the most holy place of the true tabernacle, to appear in the presence of God and receive "gifts for men." "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted," says Peter, on the day of Pentecost, "and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear"—viz., the outward tokens, and *then* appropriate accompaniments of that inward baptism which the disciples had just received in being "filled with the Spirit." For the apostle, here addressing unbelievers, very properly refers them to those exterior evidences of the presence and power of the Spirit, which were at that time displayed and *addressed to them* for the very purpose of confirming the word of the apostles and producing faith, the miraculous gift of tongues being designed both as a "sign" or evidence to unbelievers of the Divine presence and power, and also as the means of communicating to foreigners in their own languages "the wonderful works of God"—the redemption that was in Christ. Tongues were thus, like the inscription upon the cross in the three chief languages then spoken, not only an indication of the truth, not yet recognized by the apostles themselves, that the Gentiles were among those whom the Lord would call, but, at the same time, the instrument

through which that call was to be made known. These miraculous accompaniments, therefore, of the gift of the Spirit, which were for special and temporary ends, distinctly stated, and having particular relation to unbelievers, should not be confounded, either as necessary means or causes or consequences, with that "gift of the Spirit" which was promised to every obedient believer. The case was simply this: Christ was now glorified, and, the time having come, he sent his Spirit to animate his body, the Church, with spiritual life and to abide in it forever. That it was necessary, *for a time*, to confirm the gospel by signs and wonders wrought by the power of the Holy Spirit, as in former ages, does not in the slightest degree affect the concurrent, permanent, and essential fact that, on the day of Pentecost, *and not before*, God bestowed upon men the gift of the Holy Spirit—the Paraclete, the Comforter, even the Spirit of Truth, to abide forever in the hearts of believers, and to convince the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment.

It is the more important to dwell upon the distinction here made, since it is precisely at this point that men, in their blind exaggeration of signs and sensible demonstrations, lose their way, and run into either the extravagance of fanaticism, on the one hand, or the skeptical frigidity of rationalism upon the other. The vain and ignorant enthusiast who prays for a baptism in fire, and hopes for dreams and visions, and sensible signs and wonders, as attendant upon the impartation of the Spirit, is not a whit farther from the truth than the errorist who affirms that miracles were

a necessary and invariable accompaniment of the Spirit's presence, and that, because such demonstrations are not now given, therefore no Holy Spirit whatever is now received, and Christ's promise to be with his people to the end of the world has totally failed. In opposition to these most dangerous extremes, it is here designed to show that miraculous powers, whether exercised as charisms for the edification of the Church, or as evidences to convince the world, are entirely distinguishable and separable from that gift of the Holy Spirit which was to be the grand culminating fact in the obedience of the gospel and the perfection of the Church on earth. Such miraculous powers and demonstrations, we repeat, appertained to all dispensations and ages, but the gift of the Holy Spirit to Christianity alone. Those powers were temporary, but the Spirit permanent; the unity it establishes, and the precious fruits it bears in the Christian life, so incomparably greater than supernatural gifts, being required throughout the ages as the very substance and design of the gospel. It has been seen how subordinate the place which Christ himself assigned to miracles, in which weak mortals are so disposed to glory; and it is evident that, notwithstanding all the wondrous powers and privileges enjoyed by the disciples during the Saviour's ministry, they had not, at that period, received the Holy Spirit at all, but were instructed to await his coming in the future, at the glorification of Christ. Here, then, is a complete separation between miracles and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Miracles can exist—and that, too, of the

most stupendous character—apart from “the gift of the Holy Spirit.” They constitute a manifestation quite different from that promised in the Paraclete. *This was a special and peculiar manifestation of the Spirit—an interior presence, a Divine indwelling, appropriate to the gospel institution alone.*

It may be asked, in regard to the position occupied by the people of God, anterior to the coming of Christ: How could they be called the “Sons of God,” or regarded as “walking with God,” unless they are supposed to have had the Holy Spirit, as Christians now possess it? In reply, it may be remarked that we may greatly err, in taking the case and condition of one under the Christian Institution and making this a model for preceding ages. God has his own methods and plans of working, and these are adapted to the varying conditions and circumstances of the human race. Hence, while it may be admitted that the great essential features of true religion, viz., faith and obedience, have been the same in all ages, and that these have always secured the Divine favor, it is to be remembered that the modes in which this favor manifested itself, have greatly varied at different times. There was a period, when a few simple types and symbols, dimly comprehended; a few brief instructions and promises, veiled in figure; a few fearful judgments and mighty deliverances, seem to have constituted the entire superstructure of man’s knowledge of God. Again, there was a period, when a peculiar people was selected, and when a multiform system of types and shadows; a complicated ritual;

a worldly sanctuary ; a symbolical presence, revealed to men still more the majesty, the purity, justice, and truth of the Divine character, and, in its wondrous lessons of mercy and of judgment ; its prophetic visions and its triumphant hopes, prepared the human mind for that final glorious development of the Divine scheme of redemption presented in the gospel. During all these centuries, there is no evidence to show that any one received the Holy Spirit in the New Testament sense, or that such a gift would have been all consonant with the circumstances and conditions of the times. That, in every nation, those who feared God and wrought righteousness, were accepted of him is true. That he revealed himself to them in various ways, in dreams and visions, by angels and by chosen agents, and special, direct ministries, is undoubted. Still, there is no evidence that the Holy Spirit took up his abode in any heart, or that this special gift of God was any part of the plan or purposes of those institutions which preceded Christianity. We have, indeed, the prophetic type of the Spirit in the guiding pillar of fire or cloud that led the Israelites, or dwelt in repose as the Shekinah between the cherubims in the most holy place in the tabernacle, and filled the temple of Solomon with its Divine glory after sacrifice and prayer. This was, indeed, an appropriate and magnificent emblem, but it was an exterior and visible emblem only, adapted to men's religious immaturity, and in harmony with the "carnal ordinances" which were designed to lead him to spiritual truth. The very presence of the

*type* is a proof of the absence of the *antitype*,—of that actual Divine presence, which, in the Christian church, the living temple of God, was to be the joy and light of the soul. "The temple of God is holy," says Paul to the Corinthians, "which temple ye are." "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, which is in you, which ye have of God?" Again, "Ye are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. ii: 22. The New Institution was to be a spiritual one—the very kingdom of the heavens established upon the earth. It was the fulfillment of all preceding types and promises, in the realities which they but prefigured. "The patterns of things in the heavens," gave place in it to "the heavenly things themselves," and the Christian has come, not to a "mount that might be touched," nor to flaming fire that might be seen, nor to thunderings and the piercing voice of the trump of God which might be heard, but to Mount Zion, and to the city of the living God, the spiritual—the "heavenly Jerusalem."

The question here is not one of the acceptance and salvation of the ancient saints who trusted in God. All these "obtained a good report through faith," though "they received not the promise." They served God in harmony with the institutions under which they lived, and their names were written in heaven, where Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob will receive their children to the celestial feast, and from whence Moses and Elijah appeared in glory with Jesus on the Mount, communing together with him

in regard to that true sin-offering by which believers of all dispensations were to be forever perfected. The question before us could have nothing to do with that of the salvation of any under former institutions, unless it could be shown that under these, as under Christianity, the indwelling of the Spirit was made a necessary condition of that salvation. Each dispensation, each period of progress, indeed, had its own method of expression, its own appropriate intermediation. The fire from heaven which consumed the accepted sacrifice, the nocturnal vision, the angelic visitant, as well as other direct means of communication, gave, at one time, the necessary assurance of faith. At a later period, more signal, visible, and audible manifestations of the Divine presence confirmed the ministration of the Law; while special oracles were given by "Urim and Thummin," the Light and the Perfection, which rested in symbols upon the breast-plate of the High Priest; or, at a still later time, through the prophet, whose soul was brought into consonance with the fervors of inspiration by the strains of a minstrel. 1 Sam. x: 5, xix: 20-24; 2 Kings iii: 15. But, under Christianity, the signs of the Divine power and presence no longer thus appear. The "angel of the covenant" comes not to deliver personal revelations; no ephod furnishes a response to the anxious inquirer; no prophet announces a Divine vision; no seer reveals the unknown secrets of the future. The internal administration of the kingdom of heaven is entirely different from that of previous institutions. Like them,



it required external and miraculous evidences for its introduction, but in its own nature, and in its proper and permanent establishment, it rests upon the power of an inward faith and an indwelling Spirit. In contrast with all other systems, it is, indeed, "the dispensation of the Spirit," in the true and literal sense.

It is thus, in Christianity, that a higher plane of spiritual fellowship is reached, and the believer has access to the Most Holy Place by the blood of Jesus. It is now, that men shall worship God neither in Mount Gerizim, nor yet at Jerusalem, but when "the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." On Pentecost, there was introduced an era when God was to pour out his Spirit upon as many as he would call, and when true discipleship, Christ's epistle to the world, could be "manifestly declared" only in being written, "with the Spirit of the living God, not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." 2 Cor. iii : 3 ; Heb. viii : 10. It is in this very respect that Christianity is superior to all preceding institutions ; and if the views of those who deny any spiritual presence were true, and the power of the gospel now consisted merely in the logic of ethical precepts or of a heroic example, it would at once be deprived of this claim, and be justly regarded as quite inferior to preceding dispensations in its assurances of Divine acceptance, and as having itself lost the efficacy and completeness which it possessed in the beginning.

The confusion of thought which has prevailed in

the religious world, in respect to the "Holy Spirit of Promise," has doubtless arisen largely from the failure to make proper distinctions between the various Divine dispensations of religion. It would seem, however, to be still more largely due to those false theories of conversion by special spiritual operations, which have, of late years especially, been so diligently propagated. The mysticism which makes true religion to consist, not in faith and obedience, but in a special and supernatural ecstasy of feeling, independent of the gospel, and wrought in the heart by the immediate power of the Spirit, must, as a matter of course, take it for granted that the saved of all ages have been subjects of the same "operation," and have had a similar "Christian experience." This unscriptural and most erroneous notion of the regeneration which enables the believer to enter into the kingdom of heaven, has sadly beclouded the minds of a large portion of the religious world, and perverted the understandings of men, as well as the teachings of the Bible, in regard to the whole subject of that Holy Spirit "which God gives to them that obey him." So complete, indeed, is the hallucination which prevails in regard to this matter, that the plainest facts and declarations of the New Testament are utterly disregarded; and a mere theological theory, aided by the prevailing passion for sensuous impressions, has, in a large measure, replaced the faith and practice of primitive Christianity.

To conclude, however, what may be remarked

upon the condition of the people of God prior to the Day of Pentecost, it may be further added, that Christ himself most unequivocally represents it as very different, and as inferior in regard to religious privileges. Speaking of John the Baptist, he awards to him the high honor of being a prophet, and more than a prophet. He applies to him a scripture which presents him as the messenger (angel) who was to prepare the way of the Lord ; and after declaring that among those born of women, there had not arisen a greater than John the Baptist, he announces emphatically that, notwithstanding all his high dignities, honors, and privileges, "the least in the kingdom of heaven" was "greater than he." Matt. xi : 11.\* Now John from his birth, as we are informed, had been "filled with the Holy Spirit ;" that is, he had been fully supplied with that inspiration and supernatural spiritual insight required for the discharge of his prophetic office, and for the manifestation of Christ to Israel, but he had not received that "Spirit of adoption," by which the humblest believer from Pentecost might be constituted a son of God ; and hence, so far as dignity of *title* was concerned, John occupied an inferior posi-

---

\* The word rendered "least," here, is in the comparative degree in the original (*μικρότερος*), which can not be correctly rendered "least." The idea is, that one in the kingdom of heaven, though inferior in personal character, in official distinction, or in religious attainment, was nevertheless greater in regard to relative position ; as a son is greater or higher than a servant, even though that servant was a prophet, or a special messenger (angel). It is, in short, simply a contrast of terms, as indicating relative position.

tion, as the title of *prophet*, or even that of *angel*, was inferior to that of SON. Heb. i : 1-4.

We have, furthermore, in the case of Cornelius and his household, another clear illustration of the difference of the position of the people of God, before and after the propagation of the gospel. Here was a Jewish proselyte, a godly man, who was assured, by a special angelic messenger, that his prayers and his alms had come up as a memorial before God, and who had thus indubitable evidence that he was accepted of God. Yet he is, at the same time, commanded of God to send for Peter, who, says the angel, "shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." Acts xi : 14. "And as I began to speak," adds Peter, "the Holy Spirit fell on them, as on us at the beginning." Cornelius and his household were thus, prior to this occasion, accepted worshipers of God, enjoying communion with God through faith and prayer, and the appointed oblations, just as did Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, or David ; yet they were not possessed of the Holy Spirit of the New Covenant. Just as it would have been necessary for the patriarchs, if on earth ; just as it was necessary for the disciples of Moses and of John the Baptist, so was it necessary that Cornelius and his household should hear the gospel and enjoy its blessed promises in order to salvation. A new era had now dawned upon the world. The kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man had now appeared in all its fullness, as never before announced on earth, and he

had now appointed to save men, according to his mercy, by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, "which," adds the apostle, "he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that, being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

## CHAPTER IX.

Permanent Fruits of the Spirit—Nature of the Change produced in the Disciples at Pentecost—Renovation due to the presence of the Spirit—Effects the same in all—Not from Ethical Precepts or Example—New Testament now replaces the Supernatural Gifts, but not the Paraclete—The impartation of the Spirit the design of the Gospel Ministry—An Earnest, a Seal, a Witness—Interior state of the Believer—Scripture the only Test of Religious Truth and Feeling—Love the Fulfilling of the Law.

NOTHING could be more remarkable than the change produced in the religious life of the disciples of Jesus, by the impartation of the Holy Spirit. Leaving entirely out of view the special "charisms," or gifts, designed for the confirmation of the testimony, and for the instruction of the church in its period of immaturity, and which necessarily terminated when their purposes were accomplished, we would here consider only those permanent qualities and essential characteristics, which were, and are, and ever must be recognized as appertaining to the Christian life. These have been present in the Church of Christ in all ages, and are just as necessary now, and as much the immediate result of the presence of the Spirit of God now, as they were in the beginning. The special temporary

(179)

gifts have been already to some extent considered, and distinguished from those proper fruits of the Spirit, of which Paul gives a partial enumeration in Galatians v : 22, 23, and which, in 1 Cor. xiii, he generalizes under the single comprehensive term, "Charity," or Love. Let us, then, here, in the light of the Record, contemplate, for a moment, the change which appeared in the disciples, as consequent upon their reception of the "Gift of the Holy Spirit"—the "Paraclete" of the New Institution.

The first matter which justly strikes the attention, in comparing the state of the disciples prior to Pentecost, with their condition afterward, is this, that the difference noticeable consisted, not in the possession of miraculous power, (for this, we again repeat, they had enjoyed before,) but in the manifestation of new and extraordinary power in the *moral nature*. Their supernatural gifts were, indeed, varied and modified, so as to be adapted to their new circumstances and duties, as we see in respect to speaking in different tongues, etc. ; but their superior position now, did not depend on the power of working any greater miracles than they had wrought under the immediate ministry of Christ : it depended on a change effected in and upon *themselves*—a complete revolution in their inner nature ; an entire renovation of all the moral powers and sensibilities, through the impartation of a divine nature, energizing, strengthening, enlarging, and consecrating all the activities of the heart and mind. Never before had there been such ambassadors to men ; never

before were such *moral miracles* exhibited ; never before was such a revolution effected in human society, because never before had the Holy Spirit descended to dwell in human hearts, as a welling fountain of strength and blessedness ; an antepast of an eternal inheritance ; a new, actual, abiding, and sole manifestation of God on earth. Jesus had now sent another Comforter, even the Spirit of Truth, to abide with the church forever. He had not left his disciples orphans, but had himself come to them as "the Lord, the Spirit," the final revelation of Deity on earth, in its threefold character, no less than in its mysterious unity, now exhibited in the finished scheme of redemption, and now for the first time distinctly enunciated in the sacred formula of baptism.

No one, indeed, can, for a moment, contemplate the state of the disciples, prior and subsequent to the day of Pentecost, without being struck with the contrast which presents itself. Previous to this "great and notable day," they were timid, vacillating, doubtful, feeble and dependent ; after the descent of the Spirit, they present themselves as fearless, immovable, assured, and empowered with more than human strength and authority. They were, before, simple and retiring, in conscious ignorance and human frailty ; they are now, before even kings and rulers, bold, uncompromising public advocates of a religion destined to revolutionize the world. They were once a fleeing and scattered band, humble and obscure ; they are now full of a moral heroism by which they are trans-



formed into aggressive and triumphant antagonists to the false religions and sinful practices of the world. They are evidently, indeed, wholly different persons, as to all that appertains to the *moral* nature of man; for this change, as before stated, was not derived from any new miraculous power communicated, but from the presence of God's Spirit in them—a helpful, comforting, and strengthening interior spiritual force, rendering them equal to every emergency, and successful in every conflict with the powers of darkness. The gift of the Holy Spirit was to the disciples somewhat like the addition of a central ganglion to the nervous system of an animal organization, endowing this with a higher nature, and lifting it into a loftier sphere of life.

The difference in the character and conduct of the disciples, before and after the reception of the Spirit, is certainly not to be accounted for on the ground of mere supernatural illumination of mind. That they were endowed at once with superior knowledge; that they were furnished with divine revelations; that, as promised, the Spirit 'took the things of Christ and showed these to them,' leading the apostles "into all the truth" of the gospel by degrees, and enabling them to comprehend, as never before, the purposes of God in relation to mankind, is true; and that it was a natural effect of such knowledge to give them confidence and boldness as religious teachers, is undoubted. But knowledge, while it may guide and aid the exercise of moral qualities, can never replace them or impart to them that marvelous energy and that un-failing constancy so conspicuous in the primitive dis-

ciples of Christ. The renovation they experienced, was so far from being confined to the intellect, that it was here even less marked than in their moral being, so that, while they knew but in part, and still remained in ignorance and doubt, for some years, as to the calling of the Gentiles, and other matters of importance, which were only made plain to them as circumstances demanded, there was evident, from the first, in their principles of action, their feelings, their motives, their entire moral constitution, a thorough transformation. Instead of worldly hopes and ambitions, there was now a nobility of self-abnegation and renunciation truly sublime. Instead of a hesitating and timorous allegiance, there was now a devotion of soul and a consecration of life wholly unexampled. In place of limited personal attachments, there was an expansive and pervading love of humanity; and, for a calculating and cautious policy, a Divine trust that banished all fear of consequences, and enabled them, amidst sufferings and reproaches, to persist in one unfaltering resolve "to obey God, rather than men." And all this, not from any exaltation of feeling produced by enthusiasm, or from any spirit of self-immolation imposed by fanaticism, but in the utmost calmness of perfect self-possession, and in immediate view of certain and foretold results, fatal to every worldly hope, yet contemplated with unshaken equanimity and fearless resolution.

The true secret of this wondrous change was, that they had received "the earnest of the Spirit in their hearts," that "the love of God" had now been "shed

abroad" in their hearts "by the Holy Spirit given" to them, and that they were "transformed" by the renewing of their minds, (Rom. xii: 2,) and not by means of any miraculous powers, but, so to speak, in spite even of the hinderance which the possession of such powers opposed to the humility and self-devotion demanded by the gospel. Rom. xii: 3. It was Christ who was now formed *in* them, and his nature and character which were now reproduced in them. Under the influence of his Spirit, they ardently sought to save men. They counted not their lives dear to them when, by death, they might glorify Christ, and, for the love of man, they forsook all that they possessed. They sold their possessions and goods, that distribution might be made to the needy. They spent their lives amidst labors, dangers, and sufferings, in order to rescue perishing humanity from sin and death. They inculcated the highest integrity, the utmost faithfulness; the purest morality, the strictest fulfillment of all relative and personal duties, and left no means untried to elevate man, and restore him to the Divine favor and fellowship. And the fruits of the Spirit, manifested in the life of each believer, were the same in all. Each possessed the same character, formed after the same model, and animated by the same Spirit. A Christian at Rome differed not from one at Jerusalem, or at Corinth, or at Ephesus. All had the same love, the same mind, the same hopes and feelings, and were conscious that one indissoluble tie bound them forever to each other. Every-where they could be

recognized by the same fruits of love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, meekness, temperance, patience, and, every-where alike, approved themselves to be the children of God, shining as lights amid the darkness of the world.

In contemplating these facts, the thoughtful will not fail to perceive how utterly at variance they are with those theories of religion which would make the life and example of Christ the chief, or only means of renovation. Here were disciples who had been constantly associated with Jesus, and, who, for a period sufficiently long, accompanied him, witnessing his example, hearing his instructions, and enjoying personal intimacies, and opportunities, such as none others could ever possess; yet, notwithstanding all this, remaining, like Peter, 'unconverted,' incapable, inefficient, undistinguished. Surely, if the most pointed reproofs, the most effective instruction, and the most striking and complete personal exemplification of a virtuous life, in all its living power and reality, could, in any case, effect the renewal of human nature, such a result might have been certainly expected in the case of the immediate followers of Christ. Yet, we perceive that it did not occur; that neither Christ *with* them, nor Christ sacrificed *for* them, availed to effect that marvelous transformation which the day of Pentecost revealed, and which has since marked the true disciples of Jesus down through all the ages. How futile, then, are the hopes of those vain theorists who imagine that what Christ's actual life and example; his death,

resurrection, personal instructions, and presence, could not effect; is to be accomplished by the partial record which remains in the New Testament of what "He began to do and teach!" How absurd to suppose that mere ethical precepts, however important, and however illustrated by recorded examples, could have power to change human hearts, and develop at once to the world such moral heroism as characterized the disciples, so soon as they had received "power from on high!"

It is specially reported of them, after they had received the Spirit, that "all that believed were together, and had all things common." Again, (Acts iv: 32,) "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul; neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had all things common." Again, (Acts ix: 31,) "Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria, and were edified, and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort (*παρακλήσει*, *parakleseî*) of the Holy Spirit, were multiplied." Here the increase of the disciples is expressly attributed to the fact that they were "walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit;" and the *congener* of the very name, Paraclete, which Christ employed to designate the Holy Spirit, is used to denote the nature of the work accomplished by the Spirit, in supporting, comforting, and strengthening all believers. It was, thus, not so much by the miraculous powers which served as credentials to

those who preached the gospel, or by the charisms for the edification of the Church itself, as by the holy lives and loving sympathy of the disciples, that men were led to acknowledge Jesus as Messiah.\* A consistent Christian life has ever been an argument which Infidelity has failed to refute; and the meek submission of the Christian martyr has, in every age, proved more convincing than any of those signs and marvels which excite the imaginations of men, but have little or no power to change their hearts.

With these results of the impartation of the Holy Spirit before us, it may be easily seen how appropriate was Christ's declaration to the disciples: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come." The expediency here was, in fact, a necessity. The Spirit of

---

\* "Where the diadem of love is," says Chrysostom, "it is sufficient to make us known, not only to the genuine disciples of Christ, but also to unbelievers. Hence this sign is greater than all miracles, since by it the true disciples are known. If they performed a thousand miracles, and yet were at variance with one another, they would be scoffed at by unbelievers; but if, on the contrary, though they perform no miracles, they only have genuine love toward one another, they will be honored and invincible."

Again: "If thou workest miracles and raisest the dead, whatever thou mayest do, the heathen will never so admire thee as when they recognize in thee a gentle and a mild believer. And this is no small gain; for thus many will be altogether freed from evil. Nothing can attract with such power as love. Other points of superiority, such as miracles, may excite their envy; here they will at once admire and love thee. If they love thee, they will gradually be led to the truth."

God in Christ, during his earthly ministry, as we have seen, was, indeed, *with* the disciples, but not *in* them. God was then manifested in the flesh in the person of Christ; and there could be, it would seem, at this moment, but this manifestation alone. Having become a partaker of human nature, in order to the suffering of death, Jesus had yet this baptism to undergo, and was "straitened" until it could be accomplished. Restricted by the finiteness of humanity, until the wondrous purposes of the incarnation were completed, Christ displayed in himself alone, the "glory of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth," but might not then share with others that divine communion and spiritual unity with the Father which he himself enjoyed. It was not until the redemptive work was completed, until, triumphing over all our spiritual foes—over sin, death, and Satan—he "led captivity captive," and "ascended up far above all heavens," that, being thus "glorified," he "received gifts for men." And these gifts, we are told, in the strikingly prophetic language of the 68th Psalm, formerly quoted, (the application of which to the Messiah is so apparent,) were "for the *rebellious*," even for those who had crucified the Lord of Glory, and were given, as we are further expressly informed, "*that the Lord God might dwell among them.*" Nothing could be more evidently descriptive of the giving of the Holy Spirit, in all its manifestations in apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, etc., for the spread of the gospel and the upbuilding and perfecting of the saints, or

of the great end and purpose of all, viz.: "that the Lord God might dwell among them," "that he might walk in them and dwell in them," and that "the whole body, fitly joined together" in all its parts, and associated in the "unity of the spirit," might make increase "unto the edifying of itself in love." And this development of the church was no sooner attained, and all the great questions, relating to human salvation, were no sooner sufficiently discussed and revealed, than all special gifts were withdrawn, and the disciples, no longer children, liable to be "tossed about by every wind of doctrine," were left with the written documents which compose the New Testament, as containing all the teachings of apostles and prophets necessary to the Christian life, or needed in the determination of religious truth, to the end of time. It is in this precious volume, then, as connected with the Old Testament, that we have preserved to us the sum and substance of all the miraculous gifts and charisms of the church. There are no inspirations, no new revelations in dreams and visions, no supernatural communications now vouchsafed to men. These would be wholly unnecessary, for, in the New Testament, we have all the revelation needed to "make the man of God perfect and thoroughly furnished unto every good work;" but the possession of this treasure can not *now*, any more than the presence of the apostles, prophets and charisms of primitive times could *then*, enable any one to become a member of the body of Christ, without that Divine presence, that "fellowship of the Spirit"



which alone, at every period, establishes a vital and real unity with Christ. This Paraclete was "sent down from heaven," not merely for a brief season to impart miraculous powers in confirmation of the Divine testimony; not for any temporary sojourn on earth, but, in the express language of the Saviour, to abide with the church "forever."

It is precisely, indeed, in regard to this point of a greater nearness to God, a closer union and approximation to the spiritual system, that the Christian institution differs from all others. It was not in vain that, while the law and the prophets were until John, from that time the "kingdom of heaven" was preached. It was not in vain that, at the death of Jesus, the vail of the Temple was rent from the top to the bottom, showing that the way into the holiest of all was now for the first time made manifest. Nor is it without meaning, that the apostles announce, under the New Institution, that believers are made to sit together "in *heavenly* places in Christ," and are blessed with "all spiritual blessings in *heavenly places*" (Eph. i: 3); or that the kingdom of God "is righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." Nothing is, indeed, so marked a feature of the gospel dispensation as that "fellowship of the Spirit," to which the sacred writings so often refer, and to which Paul makes so earnest an appeal as a fact realized by all, when he says, "If there be, therefore, any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, *if any fellowship of the Spirit*—fulfill ye my joy, that ye be likeminded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one

mind," Phil. ii: 1, 2. It was, in short, from the presence of the Spirit, establishing unity with Christ and imparting vital energy to the soul of every believer, that the Gospel derived its power of transforming, renewing and saving men. The rationalistic or Socinian interpreter, with his moral suasion by example, and his code of Christian law, would reduce Christianity even below Judaism, which possessed, in the Shekinah, at least the visible symbol of the Divine presence. But, under the gospel dispensation, we have come to something infinitely better than types and symbols, and are privileged "to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the veil." It is here that, through Christ, we have "an access by one Spirit unto the Father;" are permitted to "taste of the heavenly gift," and are made "partakers of the Holy Spirit," Heb. vi: 4. The impartation of the Holy Spirit, indeed, was the great final aim of the ministration of the gospel. That which is first in design is ever last in execution, as ends are both the origin and the result of means. Faith, repentance and obedience to the commands of the gospel, hence precede the gift of the Holy Spirit, which is the last and final promise to the church on earth, and the possession of which indicates the existence of all essential prerequisites. The great question hence in primitive times was not, "Have you made a profession of religion?" or "Have you experienced a hope?" but "Have you received the Holy Spirit since you believed?" and it is to this

Divine gift that reference is ever made in this order of sequence, as in Eph. i: 13. "In whom, *after that ye believed*, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession." So Paul asks the Galatians, "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?" And it was thus the final aim of the ministry of the gospel, because it was the earnest of the heavenly inheritance and the seal of the Christian covenant, an absolute and infallible attestation of the Divine acceptance. "Hereby we know," says John, "that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us." Again, "Hereby know we that we dwell in him and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit," for thus was established that unity for which Christ prayed, "I in them and thou in me, that they may be one in us."

For it is to be remembered that the believer had a "witness in himself," and that the fruits of the Spirit were not all borne in the outer life, as a testimony to others. Long-suffering, meekness, temperance, patience, fidelity, might be thus displayed to the world; but love, joy and peace were matters of individual experience as emotions of the heart. The "love of the Spirit"—that Christian affection to which Paul appeals, Rom. xv: 30; the "joy" that was "unspeakable and full of glory," and the "peace of God,"\* which

---

\* The "peace of God" here, is not to be confounded with that peace with God, or reconciliation, which is the effect of justification

kept "the heart and mind" had their primary and chief sphere of action within the soul itself, and proceeded, not from reasonings, but from the Spirit himself as the originating cause. Hence, while the world could recognize, in the outer life of the disciple of Jesus, the working of a mysterious power which it was unable to comprehend; the disciple had a witness in himself of his relations to Christ, in a conscious blessedness, not less inscrutable and not less Divine. The destinies of men are in their hearts, and "out of the heart are the issues of life." It was the peculiar characteristic of Christ's teaching, therefore, to direct attention to this fountain of all human action, and to endeavor, as he said, "to make the tree good" that its fruit might be "good." "He," says Paul, (2 Cor. i: 21), "which establisheth us with you, in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God, who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." It was the *heart*, accordingly, that was made the center of all spiritual power. It was the office of the Spirit to shed abroad there, that love of God, by which the entire nature was to be renewed; and to maintain there evermore the memories, feelings, and affections appertaining to the Christian life. It was its function to bear a joint witness with the spirit of the believer. to his new and Divine filiation;

---

by faith. It is that indescribable quietude and calmness which ever presides over the heart and mind of the true believer, springing up from an unfailing fountain, being one of the direct fruits of the Spirit.

to "help" his infirmities ; to strengthen with might "the inner man ;" to assist his prayers, and even to make intercession on his behalf with Him who "searcheth the hearts." Rom. viii: 16-27.

In such statements, it is necessarily implied that the believer may assure himself of the Spirit's presence. It would, indeed, be impossible to comprehend otherwise how he could be thereby "sealed to the day of redemption," or how the Spirit could be to him at all an "earnest" in his heart. If even, the 'sealing' could be plausibly considered as a testimony only to others, most assuredly the 'earnest' could be an evidence only to the disciple himself, and an assurance of an eternal inheritance only in so far as its presence should be, in some way, realized by the human consciousness. Let the skeptical rationalist note that the "earnest" does not consist in a *belief* or admission of the fact as possible, nor in any fancied philosophical *explanation* of such a fact supposed, but in the *realization of the fact itself as actual*. For it is precisely here, that the believer passes beyond the precincts of faith into those of knowledge or experience; but this knowledge is not one that rests upon gross material contact, or visible appearances, real or imaginary, or even on any impressions made upon the internal natural sensibilities which man shares in common with the rest of the animal creation. It is a knowledge of a higher, purer, holier character ; a knowledge of God—a knowledge (ἐπιγνώσις) derived from the 'enlightening of the eyes

of the heart,'\* (Eph. i: 18); a spiritual discernment and understanding; a communion or fellowship (*κοινωνία*), resulting in the quickening of the affections, the renovation of the entire moral nature as well as in the guidance of the will. It would be strange, indeed, then, if the Christian had no heart-experiences; no inward assurances; no spiritual joys. It would be singular if he had no consciousness of his changed condition, or that he now possessed within him an unfailing source of strength and consolation previously unknown. Man is not so constituted as to be insensible to the existence and interior state and operations of his moral, any more than of his intellectual nature; nor is he at all more liable to be deceived, as many erroneously suppose, by his feelings than by his reasonings. As the excitement of feeling speedily subsides, deceit here is soon detected, and men come to regard emotional excitements with a distrust, which should be oftener and more justly directed to that imperfect knowledge and those innumerable, but undiscovered, fallacies from false reasoning, which mislead men often through the whole of life.

The warm heart may prompt to a benevolent or generous deed, but the frigid reasonings of the head intervene to repress its movements. A thousand cold and selfish considerations await the bidding of the intellect, to crush the springing emotions of ten-

---

\* The soul, the *ψυχή* is supposed to have its seat in the heart, All the best Manuscripts give *καρδίας* here, and not *δαμοίας*, as in *Rec.*

derness or love; of sympathy, charity, penitence, or trust. It is only in *childhood* that the emotional nature seems free to express itself, as it is in Spring that the flowers reveal their beauty and their fragrance. The sad experience of human selfishness, the conventionalities of society, the lynx-eyed watchfulness of personal interest and ambition, conspire to destroy the native affections of the heart, and to replace them by the empty formalities and hollow courtesies of the world. It were impossible to tell how much of evil springs from this habitual repression of feeling, which ultimately may extinguish every throb of emotion in the human breast, as continued pressure may still the heart's own pulse of life. Surely, the sympathy and tears of Jesus teach us no such lesson; nor is it thus we can become again as little children, fit for the kingdom of heaven.

There has been, unhappily, with many, a systematic and continuous effort to disparage religious feeling, and to oppose all expression of it, as savoring of enthusiasm, and incompatible with their philosophy of religion. This extreme, is but the counter-view of that theory of special "spiritual operations" now prevailing, which has been productive of so many disorders and extravagancies in religious society, to the discredit of both reason and religion. There has, hence, arisen a dislike to all excitement, and to every manifestation of emotion, as if religion were designed for the intellect alone. The advocates of modern revivalism, on the other hand, seem to regard religion as consisting altogether in certain excitements of feel-

ing. But the religion of Christ is designed both for the head and for the heart. It is intended to embrace the whole man in body, soul, and spirit, and to secure to every faculty and every department of human nature its appropriate office and its most harmonious development. It is, hence, absurd to attempt to establish any contrariety between the religion of the heart and the religion of the head, or to seek to exalt the one to the depreciation of the other. Much more is it criminal to exalt either against the religion of the Bible.

It is often the case that men become enamored of a particular religious theory, which seems to them consistent with itself and with a few fragments of Scripture taken out of their connection and misinterpreted in support of it. This theory involves usually one or more untaught questions, and consists largely of speculations respecting the decrees of God, the work of the Spirit, the state of the dead, the destiny of the wicked, the time of Christ's second coming, or some similar theme, in regard to which revelation is supplemented by conjectures and imaginations, clothed with the authority of dogmas. Each one of these systems, while it may contain in it a certain portion of Christianity, is really a distinct religion, captivating a peculiar class of men, as they may be naturally predisposed to reflection, imagination, or feeling; and, taken together, these systems maintain, by their evil influence, those unhappy divisions which exist in religious society.

The fundamental and fatal error of all these differ-



ent systems is the same, viz., that they set up something that is merely human, against the word of God. The deductions of the intellect, the reveries of the fancy, or the emotions of the heart, are exalted to supremacy, and the Divine testimony is made subservient and secondary. Orthodoxy of opinion, or some transient feeling, is erected into a standard of truth, and it is this that is trusted, rather than God. Whatever in the Bible may seem to correspond with the particular theory adopted, or with the feelings relied upon, will be accepted. Whatever seems to clash with these, must be explained away and rejected. Scripture must be, by some means, conformed to these theories, or to these feelings, and interpreted by them alone. But it is the word of God only which can afford instruction or assurance in regard to "the things of the Spirit." It is this alone which can be the standard of truth, whether this relate to the mind or to the affections of the heart. It is by this the thoughts, as well as the feelings, are to be tested, and to allow either of these to dictate the sense of Scripture, is at once to lose not only the assurance of truth and of salvation, but the possibility of obtaining it. It is, in short, to abandon Christianity, which the Bible alone reveals, and to substitute the ignorance of men for the wisdom of God.

It is especially appropriate to offer a warning against such extremes, in considering those fruits of the Spirit which have relation to the feelings, since it is in respect to these that error is most

common. It is, indeed, an undue reliance, on the part of some, upon mere feeling, and the placing of this above both reason and Scripture, that has, as before remarked, led many others to the opposite extreme and induced them to doubt or to deny any immediate fruits of the Spirit in the emotional nature, and to restrict his office wholly to the revelation of truth to the intellect. Yet it is a part of this revelation of truth that the fruits of the Spirit are love, joy, peace, and such other moral qualities and feelings, as long-suffering, gentleness, meekness, patience! And it is, furthermore, a part of this revelation of truth to define and describe the character and effects of these emotions, so that their genuineness and their true nature may be fully known! Surely, then, it is not the presence, but the absence, of such fruits, thus specially indicated in the word of God, and essential to the Christian life, that may justly occasion doubt as to the reception and presence of the Holy Spirit. Certainly, it is not a reverent and sincere acceptance of the Divine teaching upon this subject, that can be construed into an undue confidence, either in the emotions of the heart or in the conclusions of the intellect. There is, indeed, no need, at any time, to set the one in opposition to the other, since both are equally necessary and equally due to that Divine Spirit which worketh in all, "both to will and to do of God's good pleasure." Let the feelings of the heart, as well as the deductions of the understanding, be ever alike tested by the word of God, and there is, then, no danger of error or delu-

sion. There can be no room for philosophical stoicism where the teachings of the Spirit are regarded, and no enthusiasm can exist where the objects of desire are scripturally sought, and are worthy of the earnestness with which they are pursued.

It is to the heart particularly, in which reside the active principles of human conduct, that the Scriptures constantly direct human inquiry; and it is to the cultivation and proper maintenance of right affections and motives here, that Christian development and perfection are chiefly to be attributed. "Now," says Paul to the Romans (xv: 13), "may the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Spirit." Correct verbal knowledge, indeed, is necessary, and a proper understanding of the gospel; but, among the details of this knowledge, there is no particular more important to the believer than to know that he is the temple of God, and that it is his to realize that the Spirit of God dwelleth in him. "What," says Paul (1 Cor. vi: 19), "know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have of God?" Ignorance in regard to other things might be excusable, but to be unaware of the fulfillment and of the purposes of the great promise of the gospel, might well excite surprise and awaken fear.

Paul's earnestness in relation to this, may be readily seen in the 8th chapter of Romans, where he exhibits, in a most striking and particular manner, the interior state of the believer whose body is the tem-

ple of the Holy Spirit. Being under the influence of the Spirit, he minds the things of the Spirit, and "enjoys life and peace." He is in, or under the Spirit, because "the Spirit of God dwells in him;" and if Christ be thus in him, though the body be condemned to death because of sin, the Spirit is made alive through righteousness, and can even communicate life to the mortal body, in causing its members to become instruments of righteousness, thus consecrating these also [alive] to God, and presenting the body as a "living sacrifice." It is his duty and his happiness, hence, to mortify those deeds of the body to which the fleshly nature prompts, and in all things to be led by the Spirit of God, that he may be assured of being a child of God, it being of the utmost importance to him to know this, and to be enabled to approach God, not in the slavish spirit of Judaism, but in the confidence and filial spirit of adoption, crying "Abba, Father." It is in order that he may enjoy this confidence, that "the Spirit HIMSELF"—the Holy Spirit the Comforter—bears witness with or to his own Spirit\* that he is a child of God, and,

---

\* Great pains have been taken, by rationalistic and Socinian interpreters, to pervert and explain away this important and plain statement of Paul. Because in the preceding verse, *πνεῦμα* is used in a subordinate and metaphorical sense, they would have it so understood here also, notwithstanding the emphatic words which Paul uses for the very purpose of forbidding such an interpretation, as *αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα* "the Spirit himself." Or, again, others admitting that the Spirit of God indeed bears the witness, affirm that it is by the written word or gospel, and not as dwelling in the heart, These pseudo-critics who

hence, an heir of God, and a joint heir with Christ. This witness is borne in the fact of the Spirit's presence, realized by its fruits—the joy, the peace, the conscious love which it inspires, and by the aid which it imparts, amidst the pains and travails of this mortal state, in helping the infirmities of the believer, in assisting him in his supplications to God, and in making intercession for him ‘with groans which words can not utter,’ but which He who searcheth the hearts in which the Spirit abides, will recognize as expressing the “mind of the Spirit,” who “maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.” It is in the very impulse of prayer itself, indeed, that the Christian may recognize the testimony of the Holy Spirit, which, dwelling in the heart, manifesting it—

---

would exalt the word of the Spirit against the Spirit himself, seem incapable of placing themselves in the position of those to whom Paul wrote, and they talk of the “written word” bearing witness to them, as if the Bible Society was then in full operation, and every disciple in Rome had a New Testament in his pocket! In their eagerness to sustain a theory, they overlook the fact that the New Testament was not then written, and that there was no “written word” to bear the witness they imagine. It is not likely that the church at Rome had a single written document of any kind on the subject of Christianity, when Paul wrote his Epistle, nor could his language be *then* at all understood as applying to any thing but that internal witness of the Spirit familiar to all.

These Socinian critics also display their ignorance in asserting that the mere absence of the definite article deprives πνεῦμα of all reference to the Divine Spirit. They seem not to know that definiteness is given as well by *adjectives*, and frequently by mere *contrast* and by the position which the term occupies in the sentence. Rom. viii: 4, 5, 9, 13, 14, etc.; Gal. v: 16, etc.

self in its fruits, and ruling the life. becomes thus an internal evidence to the believer, and, hence, a joint witness with the mind itself, that the individual is in a state of justification and salvation.

It is in prayer that the Spirit manifests itself as an advocate. "We know not what we should pray for as we ought." We are unaware of the dangers which threaten us, for we know not what a day may bring forth, and we are unable to see the spiritual foes which beset us. While on earth, Christ fulfilled the office of Paraclete. He was the guardian and the advocate of the disciples. As the secrets of the spiritual world were open before him, he knew the dangers surrounding them, and it was to his prayers they owed their safety. They knew not that Satan desired to have them in his power that he might sift them as wheat, but Christ knew it and preserved them by his prayerful advocacy. In like manner, the second Paraclete—the Holy Spirit, knowing and seeing all the possible wants and dangers of the saints; familiar with all the things of the spiritual system, makes intercession for them, as Christ had done, being thus a helper—helping their infirmities, supplying their inability, so that while they know not what they should pray for, the Spirit knows, and intercedes on their behalf, that their faith may not fail in the approaching hour of trial, which they themselves are unable to foresee. These inward aspirations of the Spirit on their behalf, they are, hence, unable to interpret, or express in words; but He that seeth the heart knoweth what is the mind of

the Spirit, as he knew the desire of Jesus on behalf of his disciples ; for as Jesus did, so does the Spirit make intercession for the saints according to the will of God ; and this, not only for their defense against unseen spiritual foes, but for the attainment of needed graces and attributes of character, as well as for the opportunities and means of development and usefulness.

For man is not only most ignorant, of the temporal, as well as of the spiritual, dangers which menace him, but sadly unacquainted with his own actual spiritual needs, and the means necessary for overcoming his special propensities and tendencies to evil. It is, indeed, a blessed privilege that, so far as he may be able to discern these, he may, in prayer, make his requests known to God ; but oh ! how consoling the assurance that the indwelling Spirit fully apprehends his necessities, and fails not to make them known to God. Without this personal and present aid, how feeble are all poor human endeavors ! How futile all confidence in that which is merely external and formal ! Alas ! in the modern profession of Christianity, how much of materialism, how much of impiety against the invisible and the spiritual, has mingled itself with the gospel of Christ ! How different the feelings, the language, the consciousness, the perception of the modern disciple, as compared with one of primitive times ! It would seem, almost, as if the increased cultivation of physical science, with its exact methods, and its material philosophies, had given a stronger tendency to the

human mind toward the things that are seen, and enfeebled the power of faith. The progress of civilization, indeed, so-called, has been little else than a progress in things material—in physical discovery, in methods of worldly enjoyment, in the power of controlling the forces of nature for the attainment of wealth and pleasure, or for the purposes of proud ambition in the overthrow and destruction of governments and armies. But primitive Christianity brought man into direct relation and communion with the *spiritual world*. The weapons of its warfare were not carnal, and it recognized man's proper conflict as being with the unseen principalities, powers, and malignant spiritual hosts of the ærial regions—a conflict for which it furnished him an appropriate panoply in "the armor of God," and, in the Holy Spirit, conferred on him no unnecessary gift, or supernumerary guardian and assistant. Alas! into how fatal and false a security have many fallen! How few professors of religion seem to realize the nature of the struggle in which they are engaged! How vain the hope of the restoration of the primitive power of the gospel, until the primitive Spirit can be regained through the simple faith and obedience of apostolic times!

In dwelling thus upon the importance of the restoration of the Spirit of the primitive gospel in all its fullness, let me not be understood as countenancing any of the pseudodoxies which exist in modern religious society upon the subject of the Holy Spirit. In vain, indeed, would that promised Com-



forter be sought, amidst those tumultuous excitements; those unscriptural proceedings, those manipulated ecstasies, in which so many modern religionists hope to find the Spirit of gentleness and love. False views of religion inevitably generate false and artificial feelings and sympathies, created by human appliances, and having no higher origin than what is merely animal. The Divine presence accompanies Divine truth, but honors not those scenes of disorder, those frenzied, clamorous appeals, those vociferous outcries and hysterical swoonings and catalepsies which characterize modern religious revivals; for "God is the God of order, and is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints." The more ignorant and less intellectual men are, the more readily are they operated upon by those methods which revivalists employ, and the more wild and extravagant is their conduct, to the discredit of the true spirit of religion. It is evident, indeed, from the extremes and errors prevailing, that nothing is so much needed by the religious world in general as scriptural instruction in relation to the whole subject of spiritual influence, and the proper work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men. It is by the truth alone that deliverance can be obtained from a frigid philosophy or senseless ritualism, on the one hand, and a visionary enthusiasm or blind excitement, upon the other.

The Spirit of the gospel is a "Spirit of love and of a sound mind." It has given to us, accordingly, for our government and guidance, a "form of sound

words" to which we are counseled to adhere "in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." "That good thing which was committed unto thee," said Paul to a primitive disciple, "keep by the Holy Spirit which dwelleth in us." The duties of self-examination and of constant vigilance, as to thoughts and feelings, words and actions, in their individual character, and in all their mysterious reflex influence upon each other, are constantly urged in Scripture, and it is every-where implied that we can rightly determine their origin and nature. We are hence commanded to "try the spirits," to "seek the wisdom which cometh from above," to "prove ourselves whether we be in the faith," and, while the appeal is thus made to our own self-consciousness, the Holy Spirit has furnished, in the written word, abundant tests, both positive and negative, by which we may be secured from error, and be enabled to determine with absolute certainty our true religious position. If the fruits of the Spirit are manifest in the outer life, the Christian may trust the emotions of the heart from which they flow. If he loves his brethren, "not in word only, but in deed and in truth," he may be assured that he has "passed from death to life." If he hears the apostles, he is authorized to conclude that he is of God; while, on the other hand, as John declares, "He that is not of God, heareth not us." "If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father." 1 John ii: 24. "He that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him and he

in him, and hereby we know that he abideth in us by the Spirit which he hath given us." Again, God is love, and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God and God in him." That all-conquering, all pervading love, which is the primal and essential manifestation of the Spirit in the heart, ever proves its true nature by inducing obedience to all the Divine commandments, and an ever-progressive assimilation of character to that of Christ.\*

---

\* Luther, on Gal. iv: 6, remarks: "God hath sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, as Paul here saith. But Christ is most certain in his Spirit that he pleaseth God; therefore we, also, having the same Spirit of Christ, must be assured that we are under grace for his sake, which is most assured. This I have said concerning the inward testimony, whereby a Christian man's heart ought to be fully persuaded that he is under grace and hath the Holy Spirit. Now the outward signs (as before I have said) are, gladly to hear of Christ, to teach and preach Christ, to render thanks unto him, to praise him, to confess him; yea, with the loss of goods and life; moreover, to do our duty according to our vocation, as we are able; to do it, I say, in faith, joy, etc. Not to delight in, nor to thrust ourselves into another man's vocation, but to attend upon our own, to help our needy brother, to comfort the heavy-hearted, etc. By these signs, as by certain effects and consequents, we are fully assured and confirmed that we are in God's favor."

## CHAPTER X.

Means of obtaining the Holy Spirit—Faith, Obedience, Prayer—Example of Christ—Household of Cornelius, an exceptional case—Importance of the Gospel order—Unavailing, if alone—Delusions—Value of Truth—Requirements of the Church—Larger measures of Spiritual Power—Efficient means of Perfection and Christian Unity.

AS the presence of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer, not only evolves the fruits of the Christian life, but is to him the means of spiritual unity, the seal of his acceptance, and the earnest of his inheritance, it becomes a question of the utmost importance how this Divine gift may be obtained and preserved. The conditions of its enjoyment have, indeed, been already incidentally noticed to some extent, but will merit here a more particular consideration. They may be briefly stated as faith, obedience, and prayer. It is the believer only, as we have seen, who can at all receive the Spirit; his faith must be a true, that is, an active or living faith, and he is expected to ask that he may receive; to seek, that he may find; to knock, that it may be opened to him. "For if ye, being evil," says Christ, "know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him." Luke xi: 13.

Our Lord himself, who is the great exemplar or archetype for his people, presents to us, in his own case, the character, as well as the proper order of sequence of the events which establish and perfect, in human nature, that Divine unity proposed by the gospel. We read that, "when all the people were baptized, and it came to pass that Jesus also, being baptized and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily shape, like a dove, and it abode upon him." It appears, thus, that the Holy Spirit was given to Jesus after his immersion in the Jordan—after his submission to this institution, divinely appointed under the ministry of John. We learn, further, that the first act of Jesus, upon coming up out of the water, was to *pray*, and that immediately consequent upon this, the Spirit was imparted. This incident, which has not received the attention it merits, is significant and instructive, showing how perfectly in accordance was the life of Jesus with his teaching, "Ask and ye shall receive;" nor is it less worthy of note here how carefully the Scripture supplies every link in the chain of events, furnishing every thing necessary for human guidance. It gives no details that are not necessary, and nothing given can safely be omitted; because the simple fact of its being recorded is sufficient to show that Omniscience judged it needed, or foresaw that it would be needed, in some future aspect or state of the question to which the information related. It is thus here stated that, "Jesus coming up out of the water and *praying*," the Holy Spirit was imparted. Im-

portant fact! appropriate order! precious exemplification of human duty!—often passed by unnoticed, yet revealing great truths, confirming Divine arrangements, and imparting harmony and consistency to the sayings and the doings, the obedience and the blessings, which the Scriptural Record presents for the enlightenment and salvation of men.

The connection of prayer with the obtaining of the Holy Spirit, is shown again in Christ's language to the woman of Samaria: "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink, thou wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water." That gift of God, as well as that spiritual instruction, through which the great blessing of the gospel might be obtained, were to be asked for and sought; and would be earnestly thus sought by those who recognized or knew their value. Again, our Lord informs the disciples that he would himself pray to the Father, on their behalf, for this Comforter, of whose office and nature they themselves must, at the time, have possessed a very inadequate idea, and for which Christ alone, the Shepherd of the little flock, might then appropriately and intelligently pray. But after his resurrection, and when he had, for forty days, explained to them more fully the things pertaining to his kingdom, we find the disciples, with one accord in prayer and supplication, until the Spirit is sent to them on Pentecost. Nor may we say that there had not been, in the case of Cornelius, earnest prayer for the spiritual blessings of God's kingdom. For the angel said to

him as he fasted, "Cornelius, thy prayer is heard;" and we are informed by Peter that he was not unacquainted with the wonderful occurrences of the preceding years, relating to the mission of Christ and of the apostles, which had taken place in Judea and Samaria; nor may we suppose that he had failed to make these matters special subjects of meditation and prayer.

In this case, indeed, the Spirit was given before baptism, but not before faith. And, as formerly shown, it was given before baptism, out of the usual order, for the special purpose of convincing the Jews, that God had really, and contrary to their expectations and prejudices, "granted to the Gentiles repentance unto life." Neither the plain declarations of Christ, as in Luke xiii: 29; John x: 16, etc., nor the clear predictions of the ancient Jewish prophets, nor even the special revelation given to Peter, in his vision on the housetop at Joppa, were sufficient to overmaster the intensity of that Jewish separatism, cherished, not without a basis of Divine authority, during the past centuries of national existence. There was needed, accordingly, an opposed and insurmountable fact, to change the current of Jewish thought, and to divert it into a broader channel. This startling fact was the manifest impartation of the Holy Spirit, out of the usual order of events, and in advance of that public obedience to the gospel on which it had heretofore been conditioned. But this circumstance interfered not with any thing *essential* in the established order of things. It presented

itself in the interval between that which was *essential* and that which was *formal*, and found its perfect vindication in that preparedness recognized by Omniscience as involving what was essential—the purification of the heart by faith. Hence, while it was effective, as revealing to the Jewish believers that the Gentiles were brought into spiritual unity with Christ, it could form no precedent, in the ordinary ministration of the gospel, for men who could judge the state of the heart only by outward and formal acts of obedience, and, who could not, consistently with the order of the gospel committed to them, either expect or pray that the Spirit would be given to any one anterior to the usual public manifestation of faith in Jesus.

In all the other cases recorded in the New Testament, therefore, the invariable order is observed, as announced by Peter on the day of Pentecost to those who believed: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This gift was thus *last* in order, and not *first* as modern Theology teaches. So completely has "the gift of the Spirit" been confounded with conversion, and with the popular notions of regeneration, that the entire process of salvation, as given in the primitive gospel, has been reversed. The "gift of the Spirit" is made to precede both faith and obedience. The *unbeliever* is informed that it is *he* who must receive the Holy Spirit in order to the production of faith, while the believer, doubtful



of possessing it, submits his "experience" to the arbitrament of others as fallible as himself. The assurance of pardon, now wholly dissociated from that 'baptism into Christ' to which it originally and appropriately appertained, is now placed before baptism, and is made to rest on emotions or mental impressions, instead of on the obedience of faith. Thus it is, that the entire order of the primitive gospel is broken up, and the special design of its various parts changed and perverted by theological theories; so that obedience to the commandments of men has largely replaced that obedience to the simple gospel with which, in primitive times, the "gift of the Spirit" was directly and positively connected.

It would be hard to tell to what extent these corruptions of the gospel have deprived the modern church of the presence of the Spirit of Christ, or replaced this by the spirit of partyism; but it is to be feared that the existing evils in religious society are very largely attributable to these departures from the natural and proper order originally established among the different particulars or requirements of the gospel. It is, at least, lamentably true that the whole frame-work of the gospel preached by the apostles has been remodeled to suit the views of theorists; and that the "form of sound words," which still bears witness to the truth in the New Testament, is so modified in the religious systems of the day, as scarcely to be recognized. Salvation is a process, or progressive work, consisting of various successive steps or stages, and the order which God has estab-

lished among these, and their proper relations to each other, are certainly important to be observed, as well as the things themselves. As in nature, we have, first, the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear, so, in the process of conversion, God has appointed a certain succession or order of things which is most conducive, if not essential, to the proper result. The "gift of the Holy Spirit" is, as we have seen, the last of these in the Divine arrangement. All other things are preparatory. This is the completion of that system of things through which man is to be renewed "after the image of him that created him." In the Divine order relating to man, we have—1. The word of God, or gospel; 2. Hearing; 3. Faith; 4. Repentance; 5. Baptism; 6. Remission of sins; 7. The gift of the Holy Spirit. All, preceding the last, are but means of attaining to this "fellowship of the Spirit," the great end or purpose of all, and without which all forms and professions and ordinances are alike nugatory and vain. And while it may, perhaps, be conceded that a certain degree of inversion or confusion in the Divine order of sequence, through ignorance or mistake, may not wholly frustrate the grace of God, or deprive his ordinances of their proper efficacy, it yet remains true that the Divine purposes will be best accomplished, and the fullness of the blessing of the gospel be best attained, by a strict and scrupulous observance of that order of sequence which God has appointed. That the order given above is the true one, will be sufficiently plain to any one who will receive the evidence of the

Scripture upon the subject; since, wherever the various requirements and promises of the gospel are distinctly enumerated, *they constantly occur in this order*, as indeed is most appropriate and necessary, from the very nature of the things themselves.\* “Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God,” says Paul, Rom. x: 17. Reason and fact confirm the necessity of this order, since, where the gospel is not announced, there can be, and is, no believer. “Repent,” said Peter to those who believed, “and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” “Arise,” said Ananias to the believing and penitent Paul, “and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.” “In whom ye also trusted,” says Paul to the Ephesians (i: 13) “*after* that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, *after* that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise.” †

---

\* When the Scripture speaks of “Repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ,” this is no exception to the rule stated, for this has reference to Jews who already believed in God, and needed then to repent (as John the Baptist required) and to believe in Christ. Thus Jesus said to his disciples: “Ye believe in God, believe also in me.” Belief in Jesus always necessarily implies a prior belief in God, since Jesus is to be received as the Son of God.

† Upon this passage, the accurate Ellicott observes: “Πιστεῖσθαι is not present and contemporaneous with εὐαγγελισθῆτε, but *antecedent*. Compare Acts xix: 2, and see Usteri Lehrb. II, 2, p. 267. The ordinary sequence, as Meyer observes, is (a) Hearing; (b) Faith, which of course implies preventing grace; (c) Baptism; (d) Communication of the Holy Spirit. Compare together especially Acts ii: 37, 38 (a, c, d);

Such is the delicacy of the relations which exist between man and the spiritual system, and such the facility with which Satan may interpose hindrances to fellowship between God and the human soul, that it is impossible to be too observant in regard to the method or plan, which God himself has ordained, in order to the enjoyment of this Divine fellowship. It is true, indeed, that the mere observance of a particular order can never *of itself* secure this. A superficial, mechanical, mercenary view of obedience, however just the *order* of that obedience, will leave the heart of the formalist as spiritually empty and as unsanctified as at first, though filled with false confidence and Pharisaic pride. So ingenious are the devices of the wicked one, that he may succeed in replacing true faith and love by the low and groveling motives of a commercial selfishness, which is the direct opposite of the true principle of gospel obedience. Or he may induce a failure by

---

viii: 6, 12, 17 (*a, b, c, d*); xix: 5, 6 (*c, d*). Acts x: 44 (*d, c*), and perhaps ix: 17, are exceptional cases. On the Divine order or method mercifully used by God in our salvation, see the brief but weighty remarks of Hammond, *Pract. Catech.*, I, 4, p. 83 (A. C. Libr.)."

In speaking of the impartation of the Holy Spirit *subsequent*, and not *prior*, to faith and obedience, Archdeacon Hare makes the following just observations: "At all events, such is the order in which the work of our regeneration must now take place. We must be buried by baptism into the death of Christ, before we can rise again in newness of life. We must be justified through faith in the death of Christ, before we can be sanctified by the indwelling of the Spirit. The Spirit of sanctification is only given to those who have already been washed from their sins in the all-purifying blood of the Lamb."—*Mission of the Comforter*, p. 50.

vitiating faith itself, and establishing in the mind those Socinian philosophies, which produce an utter skepticism in regard to the indwelling of the Spirit, and leave the heart to a vain dependence upon mere intellection. Deceived by specious glosses imposed upon the plainest declarations of Scripture, and persuaded that the gospel comes now "in word only," these pseudo-reformers may well be supposed devoid of the Spirit, since their principles forbid them to 'seek, that they may find;' and to 'ask, that they may receive.' It is by means of this rationalism that Satan has contrived to render to a large degree unfruitful, the best and truest efforts for the restoration of the primitive gospel, which, when thus shorn of its strength, is presented only to provoke derision by its feebleness, since it is in *letter* only, but not in Spirit; in *principle*, but not in practice. Such failures and aberrations, however, detract not, in the slightest degree, from the plea for a return to the simplicity and order of the primitive gospel. This was itself corrupted in the beginning, and, in the very period of its power, failed to secure, in all cases, its beneficial ends. The record of its wondrous effect upon the many who believed in Jerusalem, but introduces the story of Ananias and Sapphira; its triumphs in Samaria herald the mercenary proposition of Simon Magus, and the impassible and zealous Galatians were soon turned away from the truth by those who perverted the gospel of Christ. These things but serve to reveal the dangers which ever beset the pathway of truth, and serve only to inspire the faithful with greater watchfulness and diligence.

The Holy Spirit is also termed the "Spirit of Truth," and he who is controlled by it can not do otherwise than labor for the advancement of the truth. To rescue the gospel from modern corruptions of it, and to present it to the world in its primitive simplicity and purity, is a great and good work, dictated by the Spirit of God. This movement is now in progress, and its success thus far, amidst all its hinderances, has been remarkable. It is impossible to estimate the benefit resulting to religious society from that emancipation from priestly rule and the intolerance of party spirit, which it has conferred. The greater liberality of religious feeling; the increased desire for Christian union; the changes and modifications in denominational peculiarities, are evidently largely due to that bold and earnest advocacy of a return to primitive Christianity, which, within the last half century, has compelled the attention of the public. But Satan may be expected to use his utmost efforts to frustrate the purposes designed, and disappoint the hopes of those who labor for the restoration of the gospel in its primitive power; and there is hence demanded, on their part, the utmost vigilance, and a firm, uncompromising adherence to the plain teaching of the Scriptures. They must realize that their mission is not accomplished until the gospel is restored in "Spirit" as well as in "letter;" in "practice" as well as in "principle;" and should labor to expose every error which tends to prevent so desirable a consummation.

In order, then, to the enjoyment of "the fullness of the blessing of Christ," it is necessary both to believe and to obey the truth; to preserve, unchanged, the Divine order of the gospel, and to employ diligently every means necessary to secure the Divine promises. Among these means, in connection with prayer, there is nothing more important than meditation and self-examination. Amidst the dangerous delusions of the hour, safety may be found only in the constant exercise of that self-superintendence, those heart-searchings, those earnest longings for spiritual fellowship, those watchings and fastings, and that self-abnegation which the crisis demands. The heart must be purified from the lusts and ambitions of the world, and be emptied of every false and deceitful trust. It must be unveiled before the scrutiny of Conscience enlightened by truth; and, in an humble sense of his own insufficiency, the believer must make his appeal to a higher judicature and cry with the Psalmist: "Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me and know my thoughts; and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting." A nearness to God, heretofore unattained, must be sought by those who would reform the world. The Church of Christ must be extricated from the materialism and worldly conformity by which it is oppressed, and be lifted into a higher plane of spirituality and power, in order to the accomplishment of the blessed ends for which it was established.

This is to be done only by a larger measure of the

Spirit of Christ. And this, as we have seen, is to be sought through faith, and purity, and prayer ; through a faithful obedience to the Divine commandments ; through the healing of religious divisions ; through a direct return to the simple gospel preached by the apostles, and a strict observance of the Divine order of its various requirements, in order that every thing may have its due place, and all things be conformed to the will of God. The final end and purpose of the entire gospel, we again repeat, is the renewal of the believer by the Holy Spirit, through which *alone* can be produced the proper fruits of Christianity, either in the individual member or in the church itself. To the individual, this gift, the Divine seal or attestation of sonship, imparts new energies and powers. "He which stablisheth us with you, in Christ," says Paul, "and hath anointed us, is God ; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." 2 Cor. i : 21, 22. The Apostle here, to impress the fact most strongly, accumulates those terms which indicate the office of the Spirit, in reference to the believer. It "stablisheth," that is, confirms and assures the believer that he is in Christ. It is the "anointing," the Christing ; the "unction" of which John speaks when he says, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One ;" and of which Peter speaks to Cornelius, Acts x : 28, in declaring that "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power." It is also the "seal," the final attestation, the necessary confirmation or token of ownership and of appropriation, by which they that are Christ's



are themselves assured, and are to be known and recognized. Finally, it is the "earnest of our inheritance"—an earnest, not merely in the sense of a pledge or assurance, but of partial anticipation or enjoyment of the inheritance, implying not merely security, but *identity* in kind, though not in degree, and the unbroken continuity of that eternal life which the Christian enjoys in Christ; "he that hath the Son," being already a participant of this life, (1 John v: 12.) It was the prayer of Paul for the Ephesians that they might be "strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man;" and that Christ might "dwell in their hearts by faith,"—faith being ever the recipient means through which alone the Spirit could be recognized or enjoyed. And the object of this indwelling of Christ by the Spirit, was that, being "rooted and grounded in love," the great principle which was the chief of the Spirit's fruits, they might be enabled to have a suitable comprehension of the wondrous things of redemption, and of Christ's love, which, nevertheless, in its boundless depths transcended the grasp of human knowledge; and this, in order that finally they "might be filled with all the fullness of God," in thus having Christ fully formed in them, imparting to them those Spiritual perfections, and that Divine blessedness of which God's children were to be made partakers. Eph. iii: 14-19.

Thus, as Christ prayed for the gift of the Spirit for his disciples, Paul also prays for the impartation of its blessings to the believers at Ephesus, as the effi-

cient means of attaining Christian perfection and realizing the ultimate ends of the gospel. Throughout the Scriptures, indeed, this matter is continually referred to, and pressed upon the attention in the most earnest manner, showing the vast importance attached to the full realization of the promise, and stating and exemplifying the means through which it was to be enjoyed.

And now, when we contemplate the religious world, as at present, in its divided and distracted state ; when we consider the Church in its present struggles with the world ; or the individual Christian, feeble and fainting amidst his trials ; when we see the apostasies, the worldly policies, the corrupted forms of religion, the plausible schemes of infidelity, and the various and innumerable evils which every-where threaten the very existence of Christianity, to what source may the necessary appeal be made for help ? Through what means may the Church be renovated and prepared to meet the impending danger, and to fulfill her mission as the pillar and support of the truth ? Shall it be by any mere ecclesiastical union ? Shall it be by any scheme of church organization ? Will a strict adherence to ritualistic forms secure it ? Will it follow from any loose and sinful compromise of Divine truth — from any plan of “open communion” or of “close communion ?” These are, indeed, some of the poor expedients by which weak mortals are now seeking to effect deliverance ; but such superficial appliances reach not the true seat of ailment. It is not by human contrivings or artificial arrangements ; by compromises with

the world, or any sacrifice of truth, that a vital Christianity is to be restored to the world ; but by seeking the old paths ; by prayer and supplication ; by returning to the primitive faith and love ; by doing the first works, and by a manifestation in the life of those fruits of the Spirit which alone reveal the verity of religion, and demonstrate to the world the Divine mission of Jesus.

But, in order to the manifestation of the fruits of the Spirit, the presence of *the Spirit himself* is necessary. In vain do men weary themselves and the world with plans of reformation ; with systems of belief ; with schemes of union based on human wisdom. In vain do they imagine themselves to have discovered the secret of the power of the primitive church in its freedom from priestly rule ; or in its supernatural gifts ; or in any other exterior characteristic. That power was, indeed, wondrous. It was truly a secret, because an interior power, and *its* secret was the *indwelling of the Spirit of God*, giving unity, imparting energy, evolving the glorious fruits of Christianity, and presenting to the world, in every disciple, an illustration of the life of Christ—a life of love, and of labor, and of sacrifice for humanity. It is the presence now of this blessed Spirit, in a fuller measure, that is the true want of the Church ; but, in order to its attainment, the demons of bigotry and of denominationalism must first be exorcised. The religious world must come and sit at the feet of Jesus, freed from its legion of theologies, and in its right mind, before it can receive his teachings. Men must return to the

simple faith of primitive times, and cease forever from those discords and dissensions which, in banishing peace, and substituting human speculations for Divine truth, have largely banished the Holy Spirit from the hearts of religious professors.

But "the hour of redemption draweth nigh." The Lord will deliver his people and revive his work. Zion shall be raised from the dust and clothed with the beautiful garments of righteousness. In that day shall the church have indeed occasion to say: "O Lord, I will praise thee; though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortedst me. Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid; for the Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation. Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation. And in that day shall ye say, Praise the Lord, call upon his name, declare his doings among the people, make mention that his name is exalted. Sing unto the Lord; for he hath done excellent things: this is known in all the earth. Cry out and shout, thou inhabitant of Zion; for great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee." Isa. xii.

## CHAPTER XI.

**Influence of the Spirit in Conversion—Confounded with “the Gift of the Spirit”—Modern Views—State of the Question—Office of the Spirit in Relation to the World—Conviction of Sin, of Righteousness, and of Judgment—Accomplished by the Divine Testimony—Results of Modern Theories—Theories Unnecessary.**

**I**N pursuing the chronological and natural development of the subject, I have heretofore considered the relations of the Holy Spirit to believers only, or what is properly termed “the gift of the Holy Spirit.” It is, however, a most important part of the office of the Spirit to influence and convert the unbelieving world, and it is proper that to this we should now direct our attention, as the great incipient work in the process of human redemption. Christianity is designed for the salvation of a perishing world. The apostles were sent out into all the world to preach the gospel, “with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven,” for the express purpose of ‘turning men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive remission of sins, and an inheritance among those who were sanctified by faith in Christ.’ There can be no question, then, that the conversion of sinners was, and is, due to the Holy Spirit, and that this constitutes an essential part of his work.

(226)

As conducive to a proper understanding of this important matter, it will be proper here, before proceeding, to consider briefly the present state of the question as it presents itself in religious society, and to obviate, if possible, certain misapprehensions which present themselves directly in the way. The first and most important of these errors is, that the religious world, very generally, fail to make any proper distinction between the work of the Spirit, in the conversion of the *sinner*, and the "gift of the Holy Spirit" to the *believer*. They confound these together, indeed, in such a manner, as to render it evident that they have no idea of any difference in the relations which the sinner and the saint respectively sustain to the Holy Spirit, or that there is, or can be, different modes of operation. As a simple matter of fact, apart from any of the metaphysical theories with which the subject is incumbered, it is perfectly clear that, in the general view of the religious community, conversion is supposed to be effected by the direct gift of the Holy Spirit to the *sinner*. It is for this he is taught to pray and labor. It is by this he "obtains a hope" of salvation. The emotions or feelings which he experiences, are taken as the evidences of a true faith; of a change of heart; of the remission of sins; of justification and of sanctification through Christ, whose blood is supposed to be mysteriously applied to the heart and conscience in this "instantaneous work," called conversion or regeneration. It is upon this, accordingly, that the individual evermore thereafter rests his hope of acceptance. It

constitutes his entire "religious experience." To it he recurs, in moments of despondency, for consolation and support. The work of the Spirit is with him, in after time, not a present reality, but a memory of the past; and conversion is conceived to be, both the beginning and the ending of that renovation, which the Spirit accomplishes. Such is the view, at least, commonly entertained. A few of the more intelligent among the different parties may have better conceptions, but such are manifestly those held by the mass of religious society, and constantly taught and practically exhibited on all suitable occasions.

There is no dispute, let it be remembered, as to the fact that the Holy Spirit imparts faith to the sinner, and gives him repentance, and leads him to confess and obey Christ. The point is, that modern theology attributes all this and more to the *immediate presence* of the Holy Spirit in the sinner; to an actual and a direct *impartation* of the Spirit, to enter into and purify his heart by a special and mysterious power. The gist of the modern view is, that this is accomplished by the personal agency of the Spirit, which is conceived to be essential, and the only thing essential, as is clearly shown in this, that the word of God is not deemed necessary to the effect, but it is supposed that this may be produced without the Word, which, in no case, is considered as more than a mere instrumentality, requiring an infusion of spiritual power, and as being, in default of this, inert and inefficacious. It is, thus, this mys-

terious "operation," internal, independent, direct, and overwhelming—a spiritual baptism—an immediate outpouring of the Spirit upon the unbeliever, in order to give to him true faith, that constitutes the popular regeneration, and the sole or chief idea of the Spirit's work in effecting the salvation of men. It is the sinner who receives every thing, and who is the subject of the only distinct and direct influence of the Spirit which the modern view admits; conversion being thus inextricably confounded with "the gift of the Spirit," which, according to this theory, is conferred thus upon the unbelieving world.

It is here that another error reveals itself in this, that modern theology makes the *mode* of conversion the essential matter. That a sinner should "break off his sins by righteousness, and his iniquities by turning to the Lord," is admitted to be well enough; but the question, *theologically*, is, was this supposed change brought about in a particular manner, and according to the rules approved by the "masters of assemblies?" Was it the result of a special operation? Can the candidate for church membership give an orthodox and satisfactory recital of the mental throes in which his transformation may have originated? If he can, it is well; if not, he will be rejected as unregenerate, since it seems to be not so much a favorable change that is required, as a change accomplished in a particular manner. Theologians, indeed, have wearied themselves and their readers with elaborate disquisitions upon the evidences of conversion, and have succeeded in involving the



whole matter in utter indefiniteness and confusion. But if any thing is to be made out of their inconsistent theories, it is this, that conversion, to be valid, must arise from a direct and immediate operation of the Spirit. Conversion is thus judged of, not by what it is, but by the manner in which it has been brought about; and the question in dispute is not the nature of the change effected, but the way or manner in which it was accomplished. It is admitted, on all hands, that conversion is by the Spirit. The debate is upon the point, whether the Spirit converts men by the evidences of the gospel presented to their minds, or by a special "instantaneous work," communicating faith by supernatural power. It is upon this question that religious controversy, in modern times, has largely turned; and, as regards the present state of religious society, there is, perhaps, no issue which needs more to be scripturally considered and adjusted.

We have seen, that the mission of the Comforter was, primarily, to the *disciples*. "He will guide you into all truth," said Jesus, "for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me, because he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." John xvi: 13, 14. This is a very remarkable declaration, showing that the Holy Spirit came not to make *himself* known, but to make *Christ* known. Similarly, Christ said of himself, "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself—I have not spoken of myself, but the

Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak." John xii: 49. Christ thus, in like manner, came to make the Father known, to whom all things are ultimately referred, and to whom, through Christ, an access was to be obtained by one Spirit. At the Transfiguration, the Father introduced Jesus, in the presence of those representing the Law and the Prophets, in the oracle: "This is my Beloved Son, hear him;" and Christ, in turn, announcing the advent of the Comforter, who was to complete the revelation of the love of God to men, declares that he also was to "speak" the things he received.

As, under all these manifestations, the unity of God is maintained, so, in all these revelations, there is perfect unity, harmony, and consistency; all being designed to exhibit, in its different stages, the Divine plan of redemption in Christ. The Comforter, then, came not to make a distinct or independent revelation, but to take of the things of Christ, and show these to the disciples; "to lead them into all the truth" involved in the mission and work of Christ, both as to his suffering for sin, and as to the things to come—the glory that should follow, in order that the Divine purposes, in him, might be fully made known to the world. This was to be accomplished by *words*; through *human speech*; through intelligible oral or written communications. Hence, as Jesus *spoke the words*, which the Father dictated, so the Spirit was to *speak the things* he heard, with which no human being could be permitted to inter-

fere in the slightest degree, in the way of addition, subtraction, or change.

The apostles, being "filled with the Holy Spirit," were fully constituted and endowed as God's ambassadors to the world, and were commanded to go into all the world and preach to every creature, that gospel which presented to men the love of God in Christ. The great object of the whole was, the salvation of the world. The church was to be gathered out of the world, throughout all ages ; as Christ himself, during his personal ministry, gathered his disciples out of the world. Hence, while the mission of the Spirit was, primarily, to the disciples, the ultimate purpose involved also the salvation of the unbelieving world, and the mode in which this was to be effected is the present subject of inquiry.

In announcing the advent of the Comforter, Christ said : "When he is come, he will convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment." We have here, then, an express statement of the work of the Holy Spirit, as this relates to the world, and the particulars here given, comprise his entire office, as respects the world at large. He was, in the first place, to "convince the world of sin." It is of very great importance to comprehend aright this declaration. The term "sin" here has very frequently been construed as *sinfulness*, and the sense has been supposed to be 'He will convince the world of unbelievers, individually, of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and of their own great depravity, and need of repentance in order to salvation.'

In view of the fact, that it is difficult, if not impossible, for any human being to form adequate conceptions of the malignity of sin, it would be neither an unlikely, nor an incorrect hypothesis to conceive, that a part, at least, of the office of the Holy Spirit would be, to assist men to form a clear and just notion in regard to their lost condition, which must, as a matter of course, lie at the very foundation of any effort for deliverance. It is a deep sense of sin, and of human frailty and inability, which alone can lead the soul to seek for refuge in the all-sufficiency of Christ; and which must ever attend the believer in his life-long struggle against the powers of evil; and there can be no question, but that it constitutes a most important part of the Holy Spirit's work, to create and maintain such convictions, essential to any movement or progress in the Divine life. A tender conscience, taking alarm at the very appearance of evil; a profound and abiding consciousness of the "exceeding sinfulness of sin;" an humble and a contrite heart which rests, "in trembling hope," upon the Divine mercy, are indubitable evidences of true religion, and of the presence of God's Spirit. It is well observed by the eminent Arnold, of Rugby: "In a deep sense of moral evil, more, perhaps, than in any thing else, abides a saving knowledge of God."

The question before us here, however, is not one respecting this, or any other general truth, but one of Scripture interpretation; and, while all that can be urged as to the importance of deep convictions of

sin in the human heart, is fully sanctioned, it does not at all follow that the passage before us has any immediate reference to these. It is amazing how great a looseness has existed in regard to the interpretation of Scripture ; how much men have been disposed to confound general with particular truths, and to overlook the most precious gems, while gazing vaguely at the wide-spread field of revelation. They seem as though unaware of the fact, that we may err, as well by substituting one truth for another, as by substituting error for truth ; and that the proper question in the examination of any Scripture is not, With what general truth does it coincide ? but What particular truth does it express ? What is the direct and immediate purport of the passage ?

“When the Comforter is come, he will convince the world of sin, said Jesus.” If this be understood of sin in general, it would be at once implied that, prior to this, the world had never been convinced of its sinfulness, and had received no proper impressions in regard to its guiltiness before God. Nay, it would be justly understood as indicating that heretofore no effort, even, had been made for such a purpose, and that it would be left to the Comforter, when he came, to undertake this most necessary work. Furthermore, it would be a fair conclusion that no one had ever been saved since the world began, as a true conviction of sin and a sincere repentance are indispensable to pardon. Such an application of the passage would be, therefore, palpably a false one, and utterly inconsistent with the facts of revelation and

of human history. From the time of the sin-offering of Abel, down through all the ages, amidst the Divine judgments, and express revelations upon this subject ; in presence of the innumerable victims upon Jewish and upon Gentile altars ; in view of the Mosaic law, with its wondrous ritual, ordained for the very purpose of imparting a knowledge of sin, and all the inspiration of the prophets, and the examples of the suffering saints of God, it would be impossible to entertain for a moment the idea, that the world was at any period unprovided with the necessary evidences of its sinfulness, or that the people of God did not always possess just convictions upon the subject. The passage in question, therefore, can have no reference to the general sinfulness of the world, or the particular state of human nature. The work which it announces is a special one. It is one which had not been, and in the nature of things could not have been, accomplished by any other agency or at any prior time. A conviction of sin was now to be imparted to the world, of which it had previously no knowledge or experience whatever, and which was to contribute more to its salvation, than any lesson, or than all the lessons, it had learned.

In order to perceive the true and precise meaning of the declaration before us, it is only necessary to consider it in its connection with the definite explanation which the Saviour himself gave. He did not leave the disciples under any incertitude as to its import, but went on to state specifically that the sin of which the Comforter would convince the world, was

*unbelief in reference to himself.* "Of sin," added he, "because they believe not on me." The reference is here directly to the rejection of Christ, in his personal mission as a suffering Saviour. He had often said to the people, "Ye will not come to me, that ye may have life." "Whom God hath sent, him ye believe not." "Ye neither know me nor my Father," etc. But there was a time approaching when the Divine purposes would be more fully developed. "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man," said Jesus, "then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." John viii: 28. It was the office of the Spirit, then, to show to the world, at the proper time, that Jesus was indeed the Son of God, the promised Messiah, and that it had sinned in rejecting him.

This we, accordingly, find to be the point first pressed upon the attention of the people, in the discourses of the apostles. Speaking as the Holy Spirit gave him utterance, Peter, on the Day of Pentecost, charges the multitude with this very sin of having rejected Christ. "Him ye have taken," said he, "and by wicked hands have crucified and slain, whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death." "Therefore," he adds in conclusion, "let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." It was when they heard this, and realized its truth from the miraculous confirmations which accompanied it, that they were convinced of

sin in not having believed on Christ, and, pierced to the heart, cried out, "Men and brethren what shall we do?" In like manner, the apostles every-where in their addresses, charged home upon the consciences of men, this sin of rejecting Christ; and, by the evidences which the Holy Spirit enabled them to submit of his Divine mission, convinced them of the unreasonableness and criminality of their disbelief. "Ye denied the Holy One and the Just," said Peter in Solomon's Porch, "and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses." Acts iii: 14, 15. "They that dwell at Jerusalem and their rulers," (says Paul at Antioch,) "because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him.—But God raised him from the dead: and he was seen many days of them which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people." Acts xiii: 27–31. But it is unnecessary to multiply quotations to show how the Holy Spirit, working and speaking by the apostles, convinced the world of sin in the rejection of Christ. In accomplishing this, we find that they reasoned with the people out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs thus have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and "that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you is Christ." Acts xvii: 3.

In thus convincing the world of sin in *disbelieving*, the Spirit, at the same time, convinced men that it



was their duty to believe; for it was only so far as faith in Jesus was produced, that men could be convinced of the sin of disbelief. To "convince the world of sin," then, because of its rejection of Christ, was simply to produce faith in Christ; and this faith, it will be seen, was produced by the testimony of prophets and apostles. The people were addressed in *words*; the proper *evidence* was laid before them, and it was when they "heard these things," that they were convinced of the Messiahship of Jesus. Faith thus "came by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." In convincing men that Jesus was, indeed, the Son of God, by laying before them indubitable evidences of the fact, the Holy Spirit convinced them, at the same moment, of sin in having rejected and denied him, when he appeared in the guise of the "Man of sorrows." *It is evident, from the narrative, that this conviction was produced by the evidence placed before the mind, and not by any direct mysterious supernatural operation upon the heart by the Spirit, independently of the Divine testimony.* It was not, as we have formerly shown, until believers confessed their faith, and became obedient to the command of the gospel, that they realized the promise, "You shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." See Acts ii: 38.

It was, thus, the office of the Paraclete to convince the world of a particular sin which it had committed, viz., the rejection of the Christ. "Of sin," said he, "because they believe not on me." This was, by way of eminence, *the* sin of that age, both of Jews

and Gentiles. "He came unto his own," says John, "and his own received him not." "The kings of the earth and the rulers," says Peter (Acts iv: 26, 27), "were gathered together against the Lord and against his Christ. For of a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done." As, typically under the Mosaic law, the sinner laid his hand upon the head of his sin-offering, so the entire world, both Jews and Gentiles, by their official representatives—Herod, Pilate, Caiaphas, called "the princes of this world," 1 Cor. ii: 8—laid their hands upon the Lamb of God, who was to take away the sin of the world, and consigned him to the death of the cross. This they did, according to the Divine purpose, in derogation of the claim of Jesus to be the Son of God; and the rejection of the true Messiah became thus the great special sin, which, first and chief of all, needed to be brought home to the convictions of men; being in itself not only the culmination of human guilt, but constituting the actual ground of final condemnation. "If I had not come and spoken to them," said Jesus "they had not had sin, but now they have no excuse for their sin." "He that believeth on him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God." The rejection of Christ was the rejection of the world's true sin-offering, and, hence, compre-

hended, in its consequences, all sin, and, unrepented of, left the unbeliever wholly beyond the pale of forgiveness. To confess Christ, on the other hand, and to receive him in his true character, was to obtain deliverance from all sin, and to enter into the favor and fellowship of God. The great and only question then was, belief in Christ—the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah. The matter at issue then was, and ever since has been, whether or not Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God. To bear witness, therefore, to the Messiahship of Jesus, and to convince the world of their sin in rejecting him, constituted the first and chief work of the Paraclete.

It was another part of his office, as this related to the world, to “convince the world of righteousness.” The sense here is not, any more than in the case of conviction of sin, the loose, general, indefinite, and pointless one generally entertained, but has a direct, immediate, and personal relation to Christ himself. “Of righteousness,” said he “because I go to the Father, and ye see me no more.” It was then, from the ascension of Jesus, and his glorification at the right hand of God, that this “righteousness” was to be deduced. It was because he went to the Father, and was no more on earth, but was enthroned in heaven, that the Comforter was to convince the world of the truth of his claims as the Son of God, and the Saviour of the world. The evidence furnished by the advent and miraculous works of the Spirit in proof of Christ’s return to God, evinced at the same moment that he had been sent of God, and

was fully justified in all his acts and in all his teachings. It showed that he had properly and rightly claimed to be the Son of God.

The demonstration of the sublime fact, however, of his ascension to the Father, involved much more than his own personal righteousness; for, in verifying and ratifying his official work, and proving the acceptance of the offering which he made to God, it reveals him necessarily as "made to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." It presents him as the Lord our righteousness, and makes known to the world that God can be just in justifying those who believe in Jesus. It substantiates and confirms the Divine plan of redemption witnessed by the Law and the prophets, and accomplished in the life and death of the Son of God. Hence, the Spirit was to "convince the world of righteousness," both as this related to Jesus and to the world itself, and to assure men of that Divine righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe—to convince men that they could be justified freely only by the grace of God, "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

Apart from the fact that a conviction of sin must necessarily precede either the desire or the gift of pardon, there was a beautiful propriety that this conviction of righteousness should immediately succeed the conviction of sin. It was in harmony with the infinite philanthropy of God, that he should thus seek at once to assuage the sorrows of the sin-stricken heart, awakened to the consciousness that it had rejected

the love of Christ, by the assurance that in him, nevertheless, there was mercy and plenteous redemption. It was this gracious revelation of the love of God in Christ which was indeed fitted to lead men to "break off their sins by righteousness, and their iniquities by turning to the Lord"—to say, in the language of the prophet, "Come, and let us return unto the Lord; for he hath torn and he will heal us; he hath smitten and he will bind us up." Hosea vi: 1. We find, accordingly, that the Comforter, speaking by the mouth of the apostles, perfectly thus fulfilled his mission, and that multitudes were thus induced to submit themselves to "the righteousness of God." "Ye denied the Holy One and the Just," said Peter to the multitude, "and desired a murderer to be granted unto you, and killed the Prince of Life." "And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers. But those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled. Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." Acts iii: 14-19. "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren," said Paul, after rehearsing the rejection and death of Christ, "that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins. And by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Acts xiii: 38, 39. It was thus characteristic of God's justification, that it was obtained through faith, and not by works of law, or any human device, and that it was a full and free acquittal to every

one who became alive unto God, through faith in Jesus Christ, who was thus made to him "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption."

As before, in the case of the conviction of sin, the Comforter assured the world of this righteousness, through the usual channels by which men's minds are reached—viz., by the facts and evidences which it placed before them, as is abundantly evident from the sacred record. "Go, *speak* to the people all the *words* of this life," was the Divine messenger's command to Peter. "Send men to Joppa and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall *tell thee words* whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved," was the angel's direction to Cornelius; who, doing as he was bidden, heard the gospel announced by Peter, and, *after* belief, received the gift of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit was, in no case, given to unbelievers—to the people of the world—in order to produce faith in them, or to convince them of sin or of righteousness. The world could not receive the Comforter as an indwelling presence. Christ thus manifested himself to the obedient, but not thus unto the world. John xiv: 21-23. These convictions were effected through the truths presented to the minds and hearts of men, opened to receive them by means of various agencies hereafter to be considered.

Similarly, in the third place, he was to "convince the world of judgment." This would be done, "because," said Jesus, "the Prince of this world is judged." When he uttered these words, he was about to "destroy, through death, him that had the

power of death," and to overthrow the empire of that mighty spiritual enemy who ruled in the hearts of the children of disobedience. When anticipating the agonies of the last mortal conflict, he said; "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again." "Now," said Jesus to the people, "is the judgment of this world, now shall the Prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." He who was "the light of the world," had carried on successfully the mighty struggle with the Prince of darkness from the hour of his temptation in the wilderness, and now, as the time of his final conflict drew near, he announced the entire overthrow of the Ruler of this world, who previously had been apparently left in almost undisturbed possession of his earthly kingdom; God having, we are told, "winked at the times of ignorance," and suffered the nations "to walk in their own ways." The time had now arrived, however, when a new dynasty was to be established on the earth, and when the Ruler of the darkness of the world was to be arraigned, condemned, and dethroned. The kingdom of God, no longer adumbrated in prophetic types and imagery, was to be really established among men. "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God," said Jesus to the Jews, "then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else, how can one enter

into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man and then he will spoil his goods?" Baffled and discomfited, the Adversary was permitted to exert his utmost malignity against the Son of man and his feeble followers, whom, but for Divine aid, he would have overcome and enslaved. Allowed, for a time, an apparent triumph, that the Divine purposes might be accomplished, he enters into Judas, and, in the betrayal of Christ, employs the hour conceded to him and to the powers of darkness, to destroy, as he supposed, that mysterious One who had, thus far, resisted his machinations and opposed his rule. "The Prince of this world cometh," said Jesus, "and hath nothing in me." For it was at the very moment when, upon the cross, he announced the completion of the sacrifice, that, with a loud shout of victory, he cast away from himself those malignant spiritual foes who had pursued and beset his pathway in human life, and, that, "having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly," triumphing over them through that very death in which they sought his overthrow. Mysterious and mighty conflict! but faintly and imperfectly realized even by the spiritually enlightened, and of which the world is unconscious; yet upon which the destinies of the human race, and even of the material universe, are suspended. Happy are they who follow the Great Captain of Salvation, and, under his banner, continue to fight the good fight of faith, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against the hosts of wicked spirits in the ærial realms,



that they may partake with Jesus in the glory of the ultimate triumph!

Religion consists not in doctrines or in abstractions. It is, on the contrary, most practical and personal. It is a person that is believed in ; it is a person that believes. It is a person who protects ; it is a person who seeks to destroy. Every-where in Scripture, the struggle is represented as direct, immediate, real ; and the Mighty Leader in the conflict, familiar with the mysteries of the spiritual and unseen world, sometimes presents to his disciples startling facts from thence, demanding their attention, or directly threatening their safety, of which they were wholly ignorant. "I beheld Satan," like lightning, "fall [fallen *πεσόντα*] from heaven," (Luke x: 18,) said he to the seventy, when they recounted their success in casting out demons. They knew not of the discomfiture and downfall of the Prince of the demons, through their labors, as did Jesus, before whom the secrets of the spirit-world were laid open. Again, he warns the disciples, "Satan hath desired you that he may sift you as wheat." (Luke xxii: 31.) Of this, they were wholly unaware, and how great their danger was, may be seen in the case of Peter, who, left for a time to himself, was led to deny his Master, and rescued from the grasp of the Enemy only through the prayerful watchcare of Him to whom all things were revealed. Christ, as the second Adam, had been set forth as the opposer of the Prince of this world, and was destined to overthrow and destroy him, and the kingdom of darkness over which he

ruled. It was a conflict of which "men in the flesh" knew nothing; and of which even the disciples, prior to the advent of the Holy Spirit, had most imperfect conceptions. It was, hence, one of the three important offices of the Paraclete to convince the world that the Prince of this world was now brought into judgment; that his kingdom was assailed, and that his followers, if they repented not, should perish with him. The Holy Spirit accordingly, by the apostles, "commanded all men everywhere to repent," announcing to them that God had appointed a day in which he would "judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he had ordained." To assure the world thus of "judgment" became a prominent feature in the addresses of those who "spoke as the Holy Spirit gave them utterance;" the judgment of the world being necessarily involved in that of the Prince of this world, who, in the passage under consideration, is appropriately made to stand forth as the prominent criminal—the "deceiver of the nations," the great "Adversary"—the Enemy of God and man; "the Ruler of the darkness of this world," "the Great Dragon," that old serpent called the Devil and Satan.

The work, then, of the Paraclete, so far as it related to the world, was to convince the world of these three most important truths:

1. The Messiahship of Jesus, or, as otherwise expressed, of their sin in not believing on Jesus.
2. The justification of sinners, as involved in the justification and glorification of Christ.

3. The judgment of the world, involved in that of the Prince of this world.

When now, as before stated, we examine the recorded addresses of the apostles to the unbelieving world, we find these to consist precisely of these themes; the forms of expression and proofs adduced, being changed or modified according to circumstances, but all having, as their chief purport, to convince men that Jesus was the promised Messiah; that they could obtain salvation through his name, and that God had ordained the judgment of the impenitent.\* The apostles were sent into the world, accordingly, to preach the gospel to every creature, and to gather out of the world the *ecclesia*, or church, whose members, believing (ἐπί) on Christ, and justified through faith, had come out from among the ungodly, that God might "walk in them and dwell in them," and that they

---

\* That the announcement of a future judgment was regarded by Paul as a part of the gospel, is evident from what he says, Rom. ii: 16: "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, by Jesus Christ, *according to my gospel.*" In his address to the Athenians, Acts, xvii: 30, 31, he announces the same great truth, as involved in the gospel facts. "God" says he, "now commandeth all men, every-where, to repent, because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." In Paul's view, the great fact of the gospel, the resurrection of Christ, revealing a future state, was itself a proof that God had appointed him to judge the world; and this, as well as the future judgment itself, was hence naturally a part of the gospel proclamation—which includes not only the simple facts, but all the inevitable consequences of these facts.

might be "his sons and daughters," separated from the world, "a peculiar people, a holy nation." The disciples were thus ever the "light of the world," the "salt of the earth." From them the word of the Lord sounded forth. By them the word of truth was manifested through preaching, and the world was thus convinced of sin, righteousness and judgment; and just so far as the truth became effective, was "turned unto the Lord." We read accordingly, of the people of the world, that "when they heard these things they were pierced to the heart," that "many of them which heard the word, believed," that the "apostles so spake, that a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed," (Acts xiv: 1); that "many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized" (Acts xviii: 8); in short, every-where we find that the preaching of the gospel was the means of conversion, that faith came by hearing, and "hearing by the word of God." In no case was the Holy Spirit given to any one who was of the world. In no case was faith produced by any internal supernatural operation upon the heart, by the Spirit, as it is fashionable now to allege. On the contrary, it was always the result of the Divine testimony, placed before the minds and hearts of men; and, in all cases, the belief of this testimony was a condition absolutely necessary to the enjoyment of the blessings of the gospel—the remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the hope of eternal life. Such are the plain and simple facts, as they present themselves unmistakably upon the faithful and sacred

record of the acts and teachings of the apostles and first preachers of Christianity.

In modern days, however, the above mentioned theories of conversion and regeneration by an immediate operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart of the unbeliever, have gained extensive currency, and have been carried to such extremes as to render the preaching of the gospel, in a good degree ineffectual ; the word of God being disparaged and neglected by many who, believing these theories, await the expected "operation," or failing to experience it, either languish in despair or become disbelievers in religion altogether. On account of the prevalence and evil effect of these theories, there are not a few who have been carried away to an opposite extreme ; depreciating religious emotions ; adopting a frigid philosophy of selfish motivity, and utterly denying that any influence except that of "words and arguments" is employed in turning sinners "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." It is greatly to be regretted that such theories, or indeed theories of any kind in regard to the mode of operation of either word or Spirit, should have been adopted and propagated upon this subject ; and that, too, as zealously as if the belief of them was as important as conversion itself.

In apostolic times, there were no such controversies, and no such speculations. The matter then was, to preach the gospel, to sow the good seed of the kingdom, and leave the event to God. The primitive disciples did not presume to inquire *how*

the seed grew up and brought forth fruit ; nor did they endeavor to establish any particular theory of conversion. They were content to preach the word, to employ all prescribed human means, and to trust in God for results. They knew that Paul might plant, and Apollos water, but that it was God who gave the increase. They were wont to expect that God would "give repentance to the acknowledging of the truth," and "open" the "hearts of hearers, so that they would "attend to the things which were spoken." But they did not, like modern religionists, insist upon any particular theory as to the *manner* in which the heart was opened to truth ; nor did they, in any one single instance, attribute this to a direct and immediate operation of the Holy Spirit. There was, nevertheless, an "opening" of the heart, a granting of "repentance," a giving of "increase" on God's part, and it seems proper, in the present state of religious sentiment, to consider, at least briefly, how Divine truth may become effective, and to show that the results attributed to "direct special spiritual operations," by the popular theory, are to be explained upon principles much more in harmony with fact, with human experience and the teaching of the Bible. In the first place, however, it will be necessary to comprehend clearly and distinctly what regeneration is, according to the Scriptures.

## CHAPTER XII.

The Nature and Necessity of Regeneration generally agreed upon—  
Importance of the Change—How represented in Scripture—Not  
an Act, but a Process—Different parts of this Process—Baptism :  
how related to it—Extreme Views—Scripture the only Guide.

WITH regard to the *necessity* of conversion or regeneration, and even in regard to the *nature* of the change so denoted, there is really, after all, but little diversity of opinion. The differences existing have relation chiefly to the mode in which the change is effected, this change itself being admitted to be both a necessary and a spiritual one. This is most emphatically declared by Christ himself, when he says that, "Except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God," and that "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." That the change here implied is a great one, and hence strikingly and justly represented as a 'renovation,' a 'new creation,' a passing "from darkness to light," "from the power of Satan unto God," "from death to life," etc., is not to be controverted. That it is a *real*, and not merely a *figurative* change, or a change of state, is likewise evident. It is, indeed, represented under the *figure* of a birth, and some might suppose the actual change

to be something quite indefinite and ideal, pictured forth as a birth merely from some fanciful resemblance. It should be remembered, however, that the figures employed by Christ, have a significance which extends often far beyond their use as illustrations. That Divine Word, now made flesh, was himself the Author of Nature. All things were made by him, and it was he who had established all existing processes and relations. An analogy employed by him, therefore, may have much more force and depth of meaning than is derived from mere resemblance. When he says to the disciples, "I am the true vine, ye are the branches," he uses not a rhetorical ornament, but expresses a profound truth. He who created the natural vine, and established the necessary relation between it and its branches, reveals a relation equally necessary between himself and his disciples. This is not the mere *illustration* but the *revelation* of a spiritual fact, which, so to speak, is even *more real* than the visible and outward semblance from which the analogy is derived, for it is Christ that is here the TRUE vine. Precisely so, when he describes the great change implied in conversion, or the entrance into the kingdom of God, as a birth, this is not a *mere* analogy, but the annunciation of a most momentous spiritual truth, of which the process of natural generation afforded the most appropriate and complete representation.

That regeneration is most appropriately termed a being "born again of water and of the Spirit," is furthermore made most evident by the frequency



with which this representation is given of it in other parts of Scripture, and that, too, by different apostles, all concurring in the same view and with one accord, making use of the same analogy. That each one of them had the same conception of the change called regeneration, is clearly shown by the singular correspondence which exists between their various utterances on the subject, and also by the manner in which they refer to *different parts of the same process*. For it should be observed, that as natural birth or generation, in its full sense, is not an act, but a process—a series of acts—a progressive development terminating in the birth of a new being, so also is the spiritual birth or regeneration. There can be no greater error than to regard the “birth from above,” as simply an act, and no greater absurdity than to suppose this act accomplished by a *reception* of the Spirit. To conceive regeneration as a simple act is to confound all analogy. To regard the reception of the Spirit as regeneration, is to suppose that which is not yet in being, to be capable of receiving that Spirit by which it is itself to be called into being! No one can be born of that which he receives, for the simple reason that he must be born, must be himself brought into existence, before he can receive any thing. Regeneration, therefore, and the gift of the Holy Spirit are matters wholly distinct, just as is natural birth, and the breathing of the air which first wakens up the dormant life of the infant.

As, in the process of natural generation, we have various particulars, stages, and agencies, so also, in a

spiritual generation, or a regeneration, have we different steps and instrumentalities. These so strikingly correspond, that, as we have said, they are constantly employed and referred to, throughout the New Testament, as different parts of one and the same analogy. Christ first reveals the fact that a man must be born again before he can see the kingdom of God, and that he must be born of water and Spirit before he can enter into it. James informs us (perhaps thirty years later) that "God of his own will begat us by, or with, the word of truth." James i: 18. This "word of truth," the usual expression to denote the gospel, is again particularly mentioned by Peter, in specially referring to this process of regeneration. "See," said he, "that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently, being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever;" and to define still more accurately, he adds: "and this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 Peter i: 22-25. Paul, in his first letter to the Corinthians, furnishes a similar identification: "In Christ Jesus," says he, "I have begotten you through the gospel." 1 Cor. iv: 15. See, also, Philemon, verse 10. Not to refer to other passages, all in perfect harmony with these, we have here, very evidently, God represented as the begetter, and the word of truth, or gospel, as the incorruptible seed which gives origin to the child of God. John, accordingly, says: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ [equivalent to believing the gospel] is born [begotten] of God." It is the gospel, then, revealed,

confirmed, and preached by the Holy Spirit, which, received into the heart by faith, gives origin to a new being, possessed of a new life, and of a new nature; and which, thus begotten and quickened by the Spirit, is now to be born of water, as the appropriate symbol of purification, and the mode of entrance into the kingdom of heaven, established on the earth. That this birth of water occurs in baptism (immersion), is evident, since, in Christianity, there is no other use of water than in baptism; and Paul expressly connects it with regeneration, in saying, "he saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit;" the washing here spoken of, being admitted by all commentators worthy of respect to be baptism. The "renewing of the Holy Spirit," spoken of here, is not conversion. This "renewing" proceeds from that "gift of the Spirit" imparted *subsequently to baptism*, and by which the entire man is to be conformed to the image of Christ, as set forth in the preceding part of this treatise.

It is manifest, therefore, that baptism, *while it does not itself constitute regeneration in any case*, is, nevertheless, necessarily associated with the completion of the process, so termed; and this, not only as the appropriate symbol of this completion, but also as a suitable token of that purification obtained through the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, which it represents. He whom God has begotten by the word of truth, the gospel, comes forth from the baptismal water as from the womb, and is thus born into a new life, all sins being forgiven, or washed away, through faith

in the blood of Christ. Hence it is, that baptism is constantly associated in the Scriptures with conversion. "Christ loved the church," says Paul, Eph. v: 25, "and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." Here, the reference to baptism and to the gospel is unmistakable. The "washing of water," here, is baptism, and this baptism is "by the word." The term rendered "word," here, is *ῥῆμα* (*hrēma*), always used by Paul of words proceeding from God, and applying directly to the gospel heard and believed; through which reception of the gospel *alone*, the "washing of water" could become *spiritually* a "washing" or cleansing. Thus the proper connection and relation of things is every-where maintained. As before cited, Peter commanded believers to "repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." Ananias told the believing Paul to be baptized and wash away his sins; and, in the great commission given by Christ to the apostles, the same evident important connection is asserted, when he said, "He that believeth [the gospel], and is baptized, shall be saved." There is, first, the belief of the word of truth—the begetting; then the baptism, the symbolic birth from water, required to complete the process, both analogically and spiritually; baptism becoming by faith a spiritual symbol—an appropriate representation of the completion of that true inward change which constitutes regeneration.

This change is denoted in Scripture in many different forms of speech, both literal, metaphorical, and analogical. It is a "believing," a "turning," as it re-

spects the sinner; an 'engrafting,' a 'planting,' a 'creating,' an 'enlightening,' as it relates to the work of the Spirit, etc.; but there is no representation of it which so fully and so fitly exhibits it, or is so frequently and so forcibly employed for this purpose, in regard both to the whole process and to the different parts of it, as that of a "regeneration," or a being "born again." It is to be noted, also, that this particular analogy connects itself most naturally with that new system of things then introduced, known first as the "kingdom of heaven," or "kingdom of God," respecting which Christ was speaking to Nicodemus when he first used the analogy. The subjects of a kingdom become such, usually, *by being born into it*. Hence the great appropriateness of such a representation in relation to the new kingdom now to be established on the earth. Into this kingdom, it was declared that no one could enter, except by being born again—"born of water and Spirit." Here, "water" and "Spirit" were both announced as necessarily connected with this birth, and neither the one nor the other was, or is, to be dispensed with. This reference to being "born of water," it should be noted, was made by Christ at the beginning of his ministry, immediately after the baptism of a large part of the Jewish people in water, as well as of his own public baptism in water by John, when his mention of "water" in connection with religion, could not well be understood of any thing but baptism (immersion), in which alone a birth of, or from, water occurred. And that the reference is to this, and to

nothing else, is abundantly evident from the fact that Paul (Titus iii: 5) directly connects a "washing" or "bath" with regeneration; as well as from the admitted requirement of a baptism in water in all cases of conversion, as commanded in the Commission, and every-where exemplified in the Acts of Apostles as immediately and invariably following belief. Precisely as the birth succeeds the begetting in the arrangements of nature, so evermore does baptism, the birth of water, follow belief, the begetting by the word of truth, in the spiritual kingdom.

Nor does this kingdom, in the slightest degree, compromise its spiritual character, in thus deriving from material nature, so expressive an emblem of one of its momentous facts. It remains in itself truly and essentially spiritual. In its own nature, it "cometh not with observation." It is not a kingdom of this world. Nevertheless, it addresses itself to men in the flesh. It places its claims before them, and they are invited and urged to enter into it. This they can not do by any natural process. They can not be born into this kingdom, as the Jews were born into the kingdom of Israel, according to the flesh. As respected the spiritual kingdom, the flesh profited nothing; a descent from Abraham profited nothing. The kingdom of heaven demanded a "birth from above," a Divine begetting, a spiritual quickening, a special and prescribed form of admission. Hence, it was, from a spiritual and unseen source alone, that the new life, and the new being to be revealed in it, could proceed. This kingdom could be perceived by

faith alone; it could be entered only by a spiritual birth. Whatever of a formal, external, or visible character it might adopt to represent, emblematically, spiritual facts to men in the flesh, these outward symbols could possess *in themselves* no efficiency, and could acquire no assimilation to the nature of that unseen kingdom which they but shadowed forth, and to which they could have even this emblematic relation through faith alone. It is from its spiritual nature, indeed, that Christianity employs, most sparingly, the visible and the tangible, in the inculcation or adumbration of its truths. The baptismal birth; the bread and the wine of the Lord's supper; the commemorative day of the resurrection, comprise its entire emblematic ritual; but no one of these temporal and material semblances can have in it any thing of truth, significance, or reality, except it be imparted by faith, and derived essentially "from above." For the sake of men in the flesh, and in condescension to the necessities of human nature, the seen may be employed as a medium of communication or of symbolic expression, but whatever appertains directly and absolutely to the kingdom of heaven, is necessarily unseen and eternal.

This conception of the kingdom was very far from the one entertained by the Jews at the coming of Christ. From the "Assumption (*αυδήψις*) of Moses," "Book of Jubilees," "Targums," and a variety of other Jewish writings, but especially from plain intimations in the Scriptures themselves, it is evident that, in the Messiah, the Jews expected a temporal

prince only, and had no thought but of an earthly monarch, under whom their nation would be delivered from subjection, and restored to its former worldly prosperity and glory. This expectation prevailed even with the disciples themselves, up to the time of the resurrection. They had no idea whatever of a *suffering* Messiah, so that even when Christ distinctly announced to them his approaching crucifixion, Peter "began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee." Matt. xvi: 22. Their expectation led them to inquire: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" and their worldly ambition prompted the petition of the sons of Zebedee: "Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory." Mark x: 37. Especially had the hearts of the Scribes and Pharisees become so "gross," and so filled with desires of worldly honor and advancement, that they willfully closed their eyes and their ears against instruction, and were consequently addressed by Christ in parables, the application of which was withheld from them, that they might remain in their chosen ignorance, disbelief and impenitence. It was in vain, that the miracles, and other evidences of the Divine mission of Christ, were placed before them; that the teachings of the law and the prophets were unfolded and fulfilled, and that their covetousness and unrighteousness were faithfully rebuked. With scarcely an exception, they had rendered themselves wholly inaccessible to spiritual instruction, and ut-



terly indifferent to the things of the heavenly kingdom.

It is, hence, easy to comprehend both the occasion and the purport of Christ's language to Nicodemus, in relation to this kingdom. He declared to him, that no one could *see* it unless "born from above;" that the Spirit alone could impart the life which appertained to it, and that its subjects must, of necessity, remain unknown to all who judged according to sense. When, thus judging, the Jewish ruler wondered, and inquired, "How can a man be born when he is old?" his incredulity as to the possibility of the new birth was reproved, by directing his attention to the familiar fact that, even the wind, which manifested its presence by its effects, was, nevertheless, as inscrutable to him in respect to its source and its destiny, as was the person born of the Spirit. "The wind bloweth where it listeth," said the Great Teacher, "and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." The person born of the Spirit might, indeed, be recognized by his fruits, as the wind by its effects, but the unregenerate world could not know or comprehend the true source whence he emanated or the future unseen glory to which he was destined. The comparison here is not between the wind and the Spirit, as many incorrectly suppose; but between the wind and the person born of the Spirit. 'The wind,' said Christ, 'is free in its movements, and these you perceive by hearing, but you, Nicodemus, can not tell from

whence it proceeds or whither it is tending; so to *you*, likewise, is every one who is born of the Spirit.' Men, judging, like Nicodemus, according to sense, could form no conception of the birth from above. They could not discover that the believer was born of God, or that his destiny was eternal blessedness in the spiritual kingdom.\*

The simple general truth here stated is reiterated again and again elsewhere. Christ himself made, in reference to his own case, a similar declaration to the Pharisees, John viii: 14: "Though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true: for I know whence I came, and whither I go: but ye can not tell whence I come, and whither I go." Just as it was with the Pharisees, so was it with Nicodemus. He could not tell any thing of the origin or destiny of the person born from above. These things, however, were

---

\* The exposition of the scriptural import of regeneration, contained in the preceding pages, was presented to the public, by the writer, in May, 1830, (Millennial Harbinger, 1st Series, vol. 1, p. 206.) Since that time, for more than forty years, it has been subjected to criticism and discussion by minds of the greatest penetration and scriptural knowledge, and has remained perfectly unshaken and impregnable. Its obvious and simple truthfulness, also, has impressed a large portion of the religious community, known as "Disciples of Christ," who have adopted it universally, as the true view of regeneration, since it rests exclusively upon express declarations of the word of God, and not upon any theological theory of man's invention. It will be seen that I quote the language of the common version in which *πνεῦμα* is once rendered "wind" but most often "Spirit." Some critics think it should be invariably "Spirit," but into this question it is unnecessary to enter here, since the change would not materially affect the truth declared and with which we are here concerned.

perfectly understood by those who were born of the Spirit. "I know," said Christ, "whence I came, and whither I go." Again, says John: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God: and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." And again: "We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness [under the wicked one]. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his son Jesus Christ." 1 John iii: 2; v: 19, 20. "The world," says he, on the other hand, "knoweth us not, because it knew him not." This failure to recognize Christ and those who were "born of the Spirit," was due to the same cause in all, and is clearly stated in Christ's declaration to the Pharisees. "Ye can not tell," said he, "whence I come and whither I go. *Ye judge after the flesh.*" This was precisely the error of Nicodemus, who, though a teacher of Israel, had failed to penetrate through the Mosaic law and ritual to the spiritual lessons which these embodied. Unlike Jesus, he 'judged after the sight of his eyes,' and 'reproved after the hearing of his ears,' and was, hence, unable to receive the "things of the Spirit," or to form any conceptions of that unseen kingdom which was now announced. Christ's teachings in regard to it were to him 'hard sayings,' as they were to others, on a different occasion, whom he addressed in similar language: "Doth this offend you?" said he. "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up

where he was before? It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." His words were, indeed, the life-giving words of the Spirit himself, revealing the means, Divinely appointed, through which alone men could enter the spiritual kingdom, become partakers of the bread of heaven, and thus attain to eternal life.

In investigating the method of entering into this kingdom of heaven as announced by the Saviour to Nicodemus under the figure of a new birth, it is indeed, ever to be kept in view, that there is danger of carrying analogies too far. Relations and resemblances may, doubtless, be introduced and applications be made of them, which were not intended, and are not legitimately involved. The full force of this caution is cheerfully admitted, and the need of its careful observance fully recognized. It often happens, however, that a caution to avoid one extreme or error, is little else, in reality, than an encouragement to run into the opposite one; or that it is used as a *quasi* justification of the opposite one. Men are constantly disposed to run into errors, and it is not to be taken for granted that they are a whit more likely to *go beyond*, than they are to *fall short of* the true mark. If a caution, then, is needed not to carry analogies *too far*, it is equally necessary that men should be guarded against a failure to carry them *far enough*. It is dangerous to pass beyond the true line of interpretation, but is it not equally dangerous to fall short of it? The proper question is,

what is the exact truth in the case? And this exact truth can be attained in no other way than by receiving *exactly what the Scripture says*. When Christ says, "be born of water and Spirit," by what authority can any one presume to omit "water," or to endeavor so to explain it away that it will signify nothing, or be synonymous with Spirit, thus putting into the mouth of Christ an absurd tautology? When Paul connects baptism with regeneration in Titus iii: 5; or when Christ in the Commission connects belief with baptism, and both of them with salvation, who has the right to separate what God has thus joined together? It is amazing what sophistries and bold assertions have been employed, in subservience to certain human theories, to undervalue baptism, to deprive it of all the significance which the Scriptures attach to it, and sometimes even to expunge it altogether from the Christian Institution. The reason is, that the theory of "Spiritual operations," commonly taught, has no use for baptism. This theory makes the begetting every thing, and the symbolic birth nothing. It seeks to aggrandize one part of the analogy at the expense of another part of it, destroying altogether the consistency and the meaning of the whole. According to this theory, indeed, there is a begetting, not by the word of truth, but by the Spirit independently of all means. No *birth*, however, follows in any conceivable sense, either symbolic, analogical, literal, or spiritual. The whole process of regeneration is condensed into an "instantaneous work" on God's part, which, by a

special exercise of power, evidently direct and miraculous, is supposed to impart at the same instant, faith, justification, and the assurance of forgiveness. In the primitive gospel, the assurance of pardon was attached to the "birth of water," baptism; but in this theory, baptism is divested of this office, in order that it may be conferred upon that "instantaneous spiritual operation," which is supposed to constitute regeneration. At the same time, the *feelings* are constituted the standard; and the Divine testimony of the written word to the obedient believer, is supplanted by variable emotions and fanciful experiences, of which fallible mortals are themselves to judge!

This modern theory of regeneration, then, evidently fails to carry out to its proper scriptural conclusion the analogy employed. It altogether dispenses with a part of it, under the plea that this is not essential or important. It has no 'birth of water,' no "washing" or "bath," in *its* "regeneration." Its regeneration is, therefore, not the regeneration of God's word, or of the gospel, which does possess both of these characteristics, and the advocates of this theory are justly liable to the charge of *taking away* from God's word what he has placed in it; an offense certainly quite as flagrant as that of adding to it. As to the *relative importance* of different parts of the process of regeneration, that is altogether a different question. That, in a certain point of view, the begetting—the cordial reception of the gospel, the incorruptible seed of the word of God into the

heart—is first in importance as it is first in order, may be readily conceded, since without this, there can be no Spiritual results whatever. But it is not the province of man to set aside any part of the process, which God has clearly appointed in order to the introduction of his children into the kingdom of heaven. In the true view of regeneration which I have given, it is to be noted, that the analogy is not carried out, in the slightest degree, *beyond* the Scripture. Not one word is added. The word of God is quoted just as it reads. No attempt is made to go beyond its obvious meaning—a meaning abundantly sustained, not only by the “analogy of faith,” but by the writings of the early Christian Church, as well as by the creeds and by the best commentators of modern religious parties.\*

---

\* Dr. Wall, (Episcopal), in his history of infant baptism, in speaking of the import of the saying, John iii : 5, “Except a man be born of water,” etc., says: “There is not one Christian writer of any antiquity, in any language, but who understands it of *baptism*, and if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of water any more than born of *wood*.” 4th London Ed., p. 116, Vol. I. The “Westminster Confession (Presbyterian,) Chap. xxviii : Sect. I, on Baptism, declares that baptism is a “sign and seal of regeneration, of remission of sins,” etc. The Methodist Creed says, “None shall enter into the kingdom of God unless he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost.” A connection of baptism with regeneration is thus clearly asserted. In the Episcopal service of infant baptism, as soon as the ceremony is over, the minister says: “Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this child is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ’s Church,” etc. Here baptism and regeneration are made identical. It is unnecessary to quote the numerous commentators who agree that baptism is referred to, in

To be regenerated, then, in the Scripture sense, is to be "born of water and of the Spirit," as Christ declares. God's children are "begotten by the word of truth, as James informs us; or "born again" of the 'incorruptible seed of the word preached in the gospel,' as Peter tells us; in 'believing,' which, as John says, they are "begotten of God," receiving, finally, according to Paul, in baptism, that "washing of regeneration," by which the process is completed. In this view, there is no "baptismal regeneration," as some have falsely charged. *Baptism is not regeneration*, though it is so termed by Phavorinus, by Justin Martyr, and by many of the early Fathers,\* and is so

---

"Born of water," "Washing of regeneration," etc., as *all* of any authority do this. In calling baptism regeneration; the Episcopal Church is clearly sustained by the practice of the early church. *Then*, however, it was regarded as regeneration *only to those who had previously been begotten by the word of truth*—who had heard the gospel and believed. The error of the Episcopal Church is, that, while retaining the *language* of the early church, it has *changed the application* of it, and says now of an *unconscious babe*, what, in the beginning, was said only of a *believing penitent* after baptism. The utter inapplicability of the epithet "regenerate" to an infant merely born of the flesh, and without one particle of spiritual life, is, in view of the actual use of this word in early times, a strong evidence of the falsity and absurdity of infant baptism.

\* Augustine, in his "Confessions," thus speaks in relation to his mother, Monica, soon after her death: "And although she, having been quickened in Christ, even before her release from the flesh, had lived to the praise of thy name for her faith and conversation; yet dare I not say that, from the time that *thou regeneratedst her by baptism*, no word issued from her mouth against thy commandment."—Shedd's edition, p. 237. Again, in offering prayer for her, he thus speaks: "I know that she dealt mercifully, and from her heart 'forgave her debt-



considered by the Episcopal Church, which is "evangelical." The true relation of baptism to regeneration can only be comprehended in properly carrying out the analogy furnished in the Scripture, and recognizing this birth of water as the consummation of the process—the formally bringing forth into the Church—into the kingdom of heaven on earth—that spiritual offspring previously "begotten of God." Upon this view, and upon no other, can it be readily explained how it came to pass that, in the early centuries of Christianity, baptism was itself called "regeneration," in the use of one of the most common figures of speech (synecdoche)—a putting a part for the whole. This usage, admitted by all to have existed as early as the second or third centuries, clearly indicates the important position *then* assigned to baptism. Had the modern doctrine then existed, that baptism has nothing to

---

ors their debts;' do thou also forgive her debts, whatever she may have contracted in so many years *since the water of salvation.*"—*Ib.*, p. 238. He here, evidently, recognized baptism as for the remission of past sins, as he does not ask for pardon of these, but of those committed *since* "the water of salvation," as he characterizes baptism; or 'regeneration,' as he terms it, p. 181 and elsewhere. In speaking, also, of his own baptism, he says: "When the time was come wherein I was to give in my name for baptism, we left the country and returned to Milan. It pleased Alypius, also, *to be with me born again in Thee,*" etc., p. 218. With Augustine, then, to be baptized was to be born again. His view of its office is evident by what he says of his continuing in his office of teacher of rhetoric for some days after he had devoted himself to the service of God. "But hast not Thou, O most merciful Lord, pardoned and remitted this sin, also, with my other most horrible and deadly sins, in the holy waters of baptism?"—*Confessions*, p. 209.

do with regeneration, and that this is an "instantaneous work" performed by the Spirit, it would have been quite impossible that baptism should have ever been *called* "regeneration" by the early Christians. The fact that they did so term it, is a proof that the modern doctrine had not then been known or invented, and that, consequently, it is false. For whatever *modification* of apostolic doctrine may be admitted as having crept into the Church, or whatever undue importance may have been given to particular points, in the age immediately succeeding the apostles, it is impossible to believe that the practice of calling baptism "regeneration" could have come into existence at all, without having had a *basis*—a foundation, a germ or semblance of truth. As baptism then was, however incorrectly, called "regeneration" in the early church, it is a clear evidence that it had, *previously*, at least an important connection with regeneration; and while it was undoubtedly an error to call the mere "washing of regeneration," regeneration itself, it might be a question whether the ancients were more culpable in this than are the moderns in speaking of the "*be-getting*" as the whole of regeneration, and in thus endeavoring to exalt this supposed "instantaneous work of the Spirit" to a similarly false position; even making it not only regeneration itself, but the assurance of justification and pardon, and the actual impartation of the Holy Spirit!

In opposition to all these errors, the Scriptures teach that baptism is the "washing" or bath "of regeneration;" that it is a being "born of water," and

that regeneration is not completed in the mere belief or reception of the truth. "As many as received him," says John, "to them gave he power [privilege] to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." Those who believed on him, then, were not yet the sons of God merely by virtue of having received the truth. *After becoming believers*, they had the power or privilege of becoming sons by being born of water, which to them was made by faith a spiritual act, and in which they were to be thus born, "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God." John i: 12.\*

---

\* It is sufficient for the argument here, that John affirms of believers that they had the privilege of *becoming* sons, as it shows they were not constituted sons, or regenerated, merely by believing, as the mystical theory of regeneration asserts, since it supposes every thing accomplished by an "instantaneous work." By "sons," is here meant those born of water and Spirit both, this being necessary, as Christ teaches, chap. iii, 5, to an entrance into the kingdom now set up on earth. It does not refer to future sonship in the kingdom of glory. John says, 1 John iii: 1: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be." It was the privilege of all believers to receive, upon obedience, the adoption of sons, and, because they were sons, to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. See Gal. iv: 6, etc. This was, and is, the prescribed arrangement of things in order to a *regular* entrance into the kingdom and its privileges. Baptists are, hence, consistent with the Scriptures, in refusing to unimmersed or unbaptized persons a place in the church; but inconsistent with themselves in refusing it to those whom they suppose to have been *regenerated* by an instantaneous spiritual act without baptism. For, if the process of regeneration has really been completed in their case, and they have truly been "born again," they are clearly entitled to all the privileges of the kingdom. As to the future salvation of those believers who, from mistake and educational prejudices, remain unbaptized and never become *regularly* members of the church on earth, though often distin-

Many of the Jews who, we are told, believed on Christ, would not thus publicly acknowledge him, and, hence, did not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Nor is it without good reason that baptism, from its nature and position, should be made to occupy so important a relation, for there could not be a more appropriate or expressive emblem of the great spiritual change, produced by faith in Jesus, than this institution, in which the individual, making a public and entire surrender of himself in body, soul, and spirit, is buried with Christ, and raised again to a new life, receiving therein the emblematic washing which represents the removal of guilt and the purification of the conscience—a translation from “the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God’s dear Son.” On this account the ancient Christians called it also the “illumination.” It is not at all surprising that a public act so expressive and important should come to be called “regeneration,” and even to be considered by some, probably, as the entire process, of which it was only the legitimate termination.

Apart, however, from the extremes both of ancient and modern days, and quite independent of the mistakes and errors which have incorporated themselves with the teaching of the Church in any age, the simple truth remains, as declared by Christ, that “Except

---

guished for faith and piety, we need not speak. An entrance into the church here, however regular in form, does not secure eternal salvation; nor have we any reason to suppose that *undesigned* omissions, or irregularities in religious forms, will impair the title of the sincere believer to the heavenly inheritance.

a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of heaven." These words remain, and the truths they teach remain. Their meaning is the same now as when they were spoken, and is not affected by either the undue estimation of baptism by early Christians, or its unjust depreciation by the moderns. Vain human theories and schemes of religion may, for a time, prevail extensively and mislead the minds of men, but they must ultimately give place to the "word of truth which liveth and abideth forever." It is the true wisdom of all to come directly to "the law and to the testimony," for "if they walk not according to these, it is because there is no light in them."

## CHAPTER XIII.

Theories of Faith—False View of Regeneration—Spirit Never given Prior to Belief—Power of the Gospel—Superadded Agencies—Truth as a Power—As an Instrumentality—Change of Heart—Mode in which Truth Acts—Theory of “Spiritual Operations” Unnecessary.

HAVING now presented the Scripture account of regeneration, and obtained a clear view of the different parts of the process, it will be proper to consider more fully that which is the first, and obviously the most important of these, viz., *the begetting* “through the word of truth.” In reference to the accomplishment of this, there are, as usual, two opposite theories, one attributing the entire efficiency to the Spirit, and the other, to the word. The former, as before intimated, makes here little or no account of the word or gospel, conceiving it to have no power “of itself,” and to be effective only as life or energy may be infused into it, in some mysterious way by the Spirit. Its advocates urge the doctrine of “total depravity,” and consequent human inability, as explanatory of the fact that, where the gospel is preached, a certain number alone receive it. They suppose that on these individuals a special illuminating or quickening power of the Spirit has been directly exerted, by which they have been regenerated,

(275)

so that they attend to the things spoken, to which they had been previously indifferent. Many contend that man is so utterly and absolutely depraved, and so entirely dead to the things of the Spirit, that nothing short of a power capable of raising the dead can change his heart, and enable him to receive the gospel. These theorists of course suppose the gospel not to be adapted to man *as he is*, but to require a special and independent force to enable it to reach the heart and mind.

It is, indeed, this "special operation" which they conceive to be regeneration itself, confounding, as we have seen, the work of the Spirit which relates to sinners, with the "gift of the Holy Spirit," promised only to believers. From their teaching, it is impossible to draw any other conclusion than that they consider the new birth and the reception of the Holy Spirit as simultaneous and equivalent; the former being an instantaneous result of the latter, and accomplished only by the direct power of the Spirit then and there specially present.\*

---

\* This is, indeed, often plainly and positively asserted by those who have been chiefly instrumental in forming the popular notions on this subject. Thus, the eminent and excellent Dr. John Owen, in his treatise on the Holy Spirit, expressly says: "There is, then, in the regeneration of the souls of men, not only a moral, but a physical, immediate operation of the Spirit on their minds by his power and grace. The Spirit of God works internally, immediately, efficiently, in and upon the minds of men in their regeneration." (*Page 183, Burder's Ed.*) Prof. Phelps, in his work on the "New Birth," says: "A third result from the principles we have received is, that we are at liberty to proclaim the offer of the Holy Spirit to the sinner, as being, in unquali-

It is apparent, from all their teachings, that they conceive the Spirit to be imparted *before* faith, and for the very purpose of "working faith in the heart." Whatever refined distinctions respecting faith theologians may attempt to make, it is certain that such is the prevailing and popular view, so far as it has any definite character at all. Hence it is, that in reference to "revivals" and conversions, we have constantly prayers that God would "pour out his Spirit upon the people;" that there might be "a Pentecostal season;" that "showers of grace" might descend from heaven upon "unconverted sinners;" that they might be "baptized in the Holy Spirit and fire," etc. In the accounts published of successful meetings, also, the conversions are constantly attributed to the "shedding forth of the Holy Spirit;" to

---

fied language, the gift of God's mercy." Here Christ's declaration that "the world (i. e., sinners) can not receive" the Spirit, is utterly disregarded. "Divines" give us the following account of the "properties" of regeneration. "1. It is a passive work, and herein it differs from conversion. In regeneration we are passive, and receive from God; in conversion we are active, and turn to him. 2. It is an effectual or invincible work of God's grace. Eph. iii: 8. 3. It is an instantaneous work, because there can be no medium between life and death, and here it differs from sanctification, which is progressive. 4. It is a complete work and perfect in its kind; a change of the whole man. 2 Cor v: 17. 5. It is a great and important work both as to its author and effects. Eph. xi: 4, 5. 6. It is an internal work, not consisting in bare outward forms. Ezek. xxxvi: 26, 27. 7. Visible as to its effects. 1 John xiv. 8. Delightful. 1 Peter i: 8. 9. Necessary. John iii: 3. 10. It is a work of grace, the blessings of which we can never finally lose. John xiii: 1." *Cyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Art. "Regeneration."



“a powerful work of grace;” a “surprising work of God,” and this work is represented as occasional and fitful, like showers of rain. “This shower of Divine blessing,” says President Edwards, speaking of the “great awakening,” “has been yet more extensive ; there was no small degree of it in New Jersey,” etc. According to this theory, then, the Holy Spirit is given to those who *do not believe*; to the people of the “*world*,” in order to produce faith by special “power ;” yet Christ plainly and emphatically says of the Holy Spirit, and in direct reference, too, to the distinction between the disciples and the world, “Whom the world can not receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him : but ye know him ; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.” John xiv : 17. Surely a doctrine which comes thus into direct conflict with the plain teachings of Christ, demands reconsideration on the part of its advocates. Surely they are not justified in urging it, as they do, as though its truth were unquestioned or unquestionable, and in making the acceptance of such a theory essential to religious fellowship.

For this notion is not only expressly confuted by our Saviour’s words, but by the recorded facts of the conversions in the Acts of Apostles. The most ordinary reader of the account given of that “Pentecostal season,” in Acts ii, for a renewal of which prayer is often so earnestly offered, must perceive, that the Holy Spirit, on that occasion, was poured out *on the disciples only*, and that it was promised by Peter to those among the multitude who believed and

asked what they should do, *only* on condition of their repentance and submission to the commands of the gospel. "Repent," said he, "and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." There is not a single case of conversion mentioned in the New Testament where the Holy Spirit is represented as given to any one destitute of faith, or in order to produce faith, according to the requirements of this modern human theory.

The opposite extreme view or error, held by others, (the "word alone theory" to which I recently referred,) is, that the first step in regeneration, the "begetting," is accomplished entirely by "the word" itself; and that this needs no superadded power of any sort whatever, in order to enable it to accomplish the purpose intended. The advocates of this view affect to rely accordingly upon the "word alone" for the conversion of sinners; and, fortifying themselves with Locke's Philosophy of Human Nature, deny that man *can* be influenced in any other way than by "motives;" by "words and arguments," presented to his mind. They, accordingly, do not believe that any Holy Spirit is imparted even to believers. They endeavor to explain away the Scriptures which affirm this, as referring merely to that "holy temper" or disposition induced by the reception of the written word; and, in entire harmony with their principles, are sometimes found to deny even that *prayer* has any influence, except upon the praying individual *himself*; or, that the soul has any separate existence

between death and the resurrection; and to attempt, in other respects likewise, to reduce Christianity to a mere system of Rationalism or Materialism. These views, which are adapted to a certain class of skeptical and philosophical minds, and which constitute, in part, what is called *Socinianism*, though held, in various degrees and in modified forms, by individuals here and there, have happily made but little progress in religious society; but, so far as they do prevail, are found to be fatal to piety, and utterly destructive of the power of godliness, however clamorous their advocates may be for religious forms.

There is, however, a view quite different from both of these, which, while it recognizes the gospel as "the power of God for salvation," regards it as the instrument or means, rather than as the efficient cause. Teaching that though a Paul may plant, and an Apollos water, it is God who gives the increase; it forbears to make a separation between God and His word, or to affirm, with the different theorists above-mentioned, either that God operates directly upon the soul independently of the gospel, or that the word has inherent *in itself* the power to reach and change the heart. It considers both the "word alone" and the "Spirit alone" theories as equally unscriptural, and deprecates the adoption of any theory whatever, as to the particular *manner* in which either the word or the Spirit accomplishes its work. Affirming that theories on this subject have nothing to do with the preaching of the gospel, it esteems

it the duty of the evangelist simply to preach the word, and leave the event to God ; without presuming to adopt, much less urge upon others, any particular philosophy or dogma, in regard to Divine "influence" and "operations," especially as believing in these, or preaching these, has no tendency to promote the conversion of sinners, and they formed no part of the commission given to the apostles, or of the preaching of the primitive evangelists.

To the individual who is guided by the word of God, and who longs to see an end of the unprofitable controversies which have divided religious society on this question, it will not be difficult to decide which one of the above views of the subject should be chosen. That the last mentioned, and practical view of this matter, ought to be acceptable to all, will appear more fully if it be considered that

1. It accords with Scripture, in admitting that a Divine agency attends the gospel, and that it is proper for Christians, therefore, to pray for the conversion of sinners in the confident hope that God will, in His own good time and way, grant their requests. It leaves, accordingly, abundant room for the exercise of the prayer of faith, and encourages human effort on behalf of perishing sinners, by a constant dependence upon Divine assistance. The apostles always recognized the Divine power and presence with them in all their labors—the successful issue of which they attributed to God. In setting out upon a mission, they were hence "recommended to the grace of God," and on their return, "they

rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles." Acts xiv: 27; xv: 4, 7, 14; xvi: 14; xviii: 9, 10, etc.

2. It does not, like the first theory, presume to dictate and to define, with dogmatic positiveness, that a "special operation of the Spirit" is the one thing, or the only thing needed in order to render the gospel effective. The doctrine of "total hereditary depravity," in its popular acceptation, on which this theory really rests, requires, as a matter of course, this immediate and miraculous exercise of power in every case of conversion alike. The supposed depravity being "total," there are no degrees of it.\*

---

\* There was never, perhaps, a more unfortunate theological phrase than this of "Total Hereditary Depravity," nor could there be a better illustration of the impropriety of substituting unscriptural expressions for the diction of the Holy Spirit. This phrase has been prolific of evil results, both as it respects the advocates, and the opponents of the doctrine. "There is a way of maintaining the utter depravity of our nature," says Dr. Chalmers, "and of doing it in such a style of sweeping and of vehement asseveration, as to render it not merely obnoxious to the taste, but obnoxious to the understanding. On this subject, there is often a roundness, and temerity of announcement, which any intelligent man, looking at the phenomena of human character with his own eyes, can not go along with; and thus it is, that there are injudicious defenders of orthodoxy, who have mustered against it not merely a positive dislike, but a positive strength of observation and argument. Let the nature of man be a ruin, as it certainly is, it is obvious to the most common discernment, that it does not offer one unvaried and unalleviated mass of deformity. There are certain phases and certain exhibitions of this matter which are more lovely than others, certain traits of character, not due to the

The same remedy is demanded equally for all, and the gospel, however it may be presented, is supposed to be so ill adapted to man's condition, that it can

---

operation of Christianity at all, and yet calling forth our admiration and our tenderness. . . . The classic page of antiquity sparkles with repeated exemplifications of what is bright and beautiful in the character of man." These exhibitions of what is pure and lovely, however, Dr. Chalmers goes on to say, may be given by an individual "who never subordinates one affection to the will of the Almighty, and is as careless and as unconcerned about God, as if the native tendencies of his constitution had compounded him into a monster of deformity, and who just as effectually realizes this attribute of rebellion against his Maker, as the most loathsome and profligate of his species," etc.

"Total Depravity," indeed, according to the definition of some of its more moderate advocates, consists essentially in the mere absence from the human heart, of love to God, and to our neighbor, rather than in any positive quality; while others associate with it necessarily an inbred enmity to both. So various and so inconsistent, however, are the notions entertained of the nature of this depravity as well as of its totality, that nothing fixed or definite seems attainable. By its being total, some mean merely that "unrenewed men, universally, are entirely destitute of the genuine principle of holy obedience; that is, of the love of God and man enjoined in the Divine Law." They do not mean that man is as bad as he can be, but that there is wanting in him, by nature, that which alone can be truly recognized as good. Generally speaking, Calvinists hold, says Evans in his *History of Christian Sects*, p. 79, that "mankind are totally depraved in consequence of the fall; and by virtue of Adam's being their public head, the guilt of his sin was imputed, and a corrupt nature conveyed to all his posterity, from which proceed all actual transgressions." The Hopkinsian Calvinists state it thus: "That though men became sinners by Adam, according to a Divine constitution, yet they have, and are accountable for, no sins but personal." The creed subscribed by the Andover professors, says, on the other hand, that "by nature every man is personally depraved, destitute of holiness, unlike and

produce no saving effect, and can not even be believed, until this "spiritual operation" has been first performed. It is true, indeed, that no one has ever

---

opposed to God; and that previously to the renewing agency of the DIVINE SPIRIT, all his moral actions are adverse to the character and glory of God."

Thus it is, that religious questions are perplexed and complicated by human theories and dogmas. Apparently confounding condition and quality, the advocates of the doctrine of Total Depravity seem to have overlooked the fact that state and character do not necessarily correspond, and that while man's condition since the fall, is one of separation from God, his actual character varies with his circumstances, and with his own peculiar individuality.

The simple facts in the case may, perhaps, be stated thus: Man is born into the world in this state of separation from God; a state recognized as one of spiritual death, the condition of Adam after the fall. In this state of separation, the child has no knowledge of God or of spiritual things whatever—a negative condition which has most incorrectly and unfortunately been characterized by theologians as "total, hereditary depravity." It is many years after birth, before man is so fully developed in his intellectual and moral natures, as to be constituted a moral agent. During this period of childhood, the carnal nature naturally takes precedence; the bodily or animal faculties instinctively exercise themselves upon wordly objects, and a love for the pleasures of sense, together with selfish and unholy principles, gradually become predominant. "The law of sin," Augustine observes, "is the violence of custom, whereby the mind is *drawn* and *holden* even against its will, but deservedly, for that it willingly fell into it." The degree to which this actual moral guilt or depravity extends, varies with the circumstances. In some, the animal passions are, from the first, stronger than in others, owing, doubtless, partly to constitution or natural organization. In others, the intellectual nature attains early development. Education and nurture, also, can do much to repress the growth of evil principles and habits, and to promote the establishment of such as are good. Nevertheless, such is the predominance of the carnal nature, that all who attain to moral responsibility

been able to define precisely the nature of this "operation," and there are not a few, who, without having experienced it at all, are, like the eminent Dr. Francis

---

are found to be sinners against God; and, as described in Scripture, all are "dead in trespasses and sins, walking according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit who now worketh in the children of disobedience;" that is, the devil, that old serpent, who, as he deceived Eve by his subtlety, continues to tempt and deceive mankind by the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life. The degree of guilt and of actual depravity, however, as before remarked, will vary in each particular case. In some, there may be a complete extinction of all moral feeling—a searing of the conscience as with a heated iron—an utter subjugation of the human nature to the power of the evil One; a state hopeless and irrecoverable. In others, there may remain various degrees of susceptibility to moral and religious impressions. But *all* are alike in a state of condemnation, "alienated from the life of God," "walking more or less after the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and by nature, [*i. e.*, in this, their natural condition,] the children of wrath."

From this lost condition, this spiritual death, man can be delivered only by the grace of God, who is rich in mercy, and who, for his great love wherewith he loved mankind, even when they were dead in sins, quickens, or makes alive those who are willing to receive the truth. "He that heareth my word," said Jesus, "and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death to life." It is the "dead in sins," who may nevertheless "hear the voice of the Son of God," and "they that hear," says Jesus "shall live." Hearing is thus the means of life, since "faith cometh by hearing," and it is "by faith the just shall live." But until men can be brought to believe that "God is, and that he is the rewarder of those that diligently seek him," they will, and must remain in their naturally lost condition.

The "Son of Man," who "came to save them that were lost," in order to the accomplishment of this work, took part himself of flesh and blood, and was tempted in all points as men are, yet without sin.



Wayland, admitted to have been converted. Still, the doctrine continues to be insisted on, and is preached to sinners as if it were a most necessary part of the gospel proclamation, and an indispensable preliminary to true belief; and as though it were *easier* to believe the doctrines of *men* in regard to this *theory*, than the testimony of *God* respecting the gospel. The correct view, on the other hand, while admitting man's alienation from God, embodies in it no such extreme theory of human inability as makes him incapable of believing the gospel upon the Divine evidences which sustain it. Recognizing him truly, as "dead in sins," and in a state of separation from God, it does not conceive him "dead" as respects that reason and understanding to which the gospel

---

The human nature which he shared in common with us, was not alone, but was associated, from the moment of his conception, with a Divine nature. In him, this Divine nature ever preponderated, and, through all his youthful years, he, by his perfect obedience, grew in favor with God and man, being "holy, harmless, and undefiled." This, however, could not have been said, if the extreme view of the inherent depravity of human nature, generally taught, were true, for, in partaking of that nature, Christ would have participated in that "total hereditary depravity" asserted as inherent in it, unless the doctrine of the "immaculate conception" of Mary could be supposed to secure exemption. This Divine Saviour, moreover, took into his arms little children, and blessing them, said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." Now, if depravity were that hereditary, absolute, and actual abasement, and personal guiltiness which many advocates of the theory assert, it was as great in these children as in adults; and if so, it would have been impossible that Christ should have set them forth as models, in any moral point of view, for those who sought to enter the kingdom of purity and love.

addresses itself, and through which it has power to reach the moral nature, if not willfully rejected.\* It regards the power of the gospel as residing in its facts—its truths—in the love of God which it reveals—in the great and precious promises it presents—in the Divine authority which resides in it. An increase of its power would be hence impossible, unless new facts and truths and promises and authority could be added, giving a still higher demonstration of God's love for men, or right to guide them. But as this can not be, the gospel can receive no actual or absolute augmentation of power.

Prof. Phelps, in his treatise on the "New Birth," has the following just observations in the section treating of "Truth as a Power." "It is difficult," says he, "to mistake the import of the text: 'Of his own will begat He us with the word of truth.' To

---

\* Vain is the reference made, by objectors, to 1 Cor. ii : 14, where Paul says "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Paul's "natural man," was the individual, who, like the Greek philosopher, rejected revelation as a source of knowledge, relying altogether upon natural or sensible means of information and the "wisdom of this world." The "things of the Spirit," therefore, presented in the gospel, were to him absurd and incredible, and it was impossible for him to know them, because they could be learned only through the words of the Spirit given by revelation, which he rejected. The spiritual man, on the other hand, was the person who received the truths revealed by the Spirit, which could be "discerned" or discovered by no natural methods, but only spiritually, by the revelation of the Spirit, who knew the "things of God," and made them known, not in words taught by human wisdom, but in those chosen by the Spirit himself.

the same effect is the Psalmist's declaration: 'The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.' The entire burden of the 119th Psalm is a tribute of adoration to Truth, as an instrument of Divine purposes. Why was Paul 'not ashamed of the gospel of Christ?' Because 'it is the power of God unto salvation,' (p. 105.) Upon the instrumentality of Truth as a fact in regeneration, he says: "So far as we can know, God never dispenses with the agency of Truth in renewing the hearts of men. If a question be raised here, it should concern, not the power of God, but the facts of his working. So far as any essential doctrine of Theology is concerned, it may or may not be true that infinite power *can* regenerate a soul by other instrumentalities, or without the intervention of instrument. For the purposes of a practical faith it may, or may not be true that, in the nature of things, regeneration is an act which, apart from the instrumentality of truth, sustains no relation even to omnipotence. Be it so or be it not, that to the Divine Mind, truth and regeneration—the instrument and the effect—stand in relations of necessity immutable and eternal, like the laws of numbers or of diagrams, we need not affirm or deny. The theological question, if any exists, is a simple question of fact. Does God, in the renewal of a human soul, ever dispense with truth as the instrument of the change?

"The answer to this question is not wholly unimportant to consistency of faith. It can be given in

few words. It is comprised in two positions, which a moment's reflection will establish.

“One is, that if God does, in any instance, dispense with truth as his moral instrument in the new birth, the evidence of this fact must be a subject of pure revelation. Experience, from the nature of the case, can not prove it. No man can intelligently affirm himself to be conscious of a Divine fiat thrilling his nature, making a new man of him, with no instrumental agency, or with other instrumentality than that of truth. The only evidence any man can have from experience, that his heart is changed, is the evidence of actual exercises of heart in view of truth. Divine power in the change is, to all consciousness, so blended with the force of truth,—in other words, the efficient cause so interpenetrates the instrumental cause,—that no mind can intelligently separate them. Indeed, consciousness gives us no hint of the Divine Cause, except through the success of the instrument. I can not go back of my own conscious exercises in view of truth, and affirm that God has changed my heart by sheer will, independently of truth. It is plainly impossible; as absolutely so as that my eye should detect the undulations of sound or my ear those of light. Regeneration, the Divine act, is evidenced to consciousness only by conversion, the human change; and this, again, discloses itself only in responses of the soul to truth. Experience can go no further back than this; and if experience can not, observation can not. If, then, God has ever wrought the renewal of a soul in such an-

omalous manner as that implied in the inquiry before us, the evidence of the fact must be a subject of direct and supernatural revelation; we can *know* it only from the Scriptures.

“The second position, then, in answer to this inquiry, is, that the Scriptures are silent as to the occurrence of any such instance in the history of redemption. They do not explicitly deny, but neither do they affirm. They inform us of many instances of regeneration by means of truth; and of not one without the truth. They proclaim, indubitably, the *law* of Divine working in this phenomenon of human experience; and they neither, by assertion nor hint, point us to a solitary exception. They record none in the world's history; they predict none in its future. Here, therefore, argument on this topic may legitimately end. In all our positive reasonings upon it we must assume that no such exception exists. In our practical uses of the doctrine we must assume that none will exist to the end of time. We can not logically found any article of our faith on the hypothetical position that the fact is otherwise.” Pp. 112-115.

Prof. Phelps insists, nevertheless, that power is superadded to truth; that truth is “energized by the will of God;” that “over and above all natural tendencies and finite agencies, God performs an act of sovereign power in every change of character from sin to holiness.” This is the usual theological view, upon which we need only remark here that since, according to the above reasoning of Prof. P., this

special act of Divine power, supposed to be exerted upon the heart, can not be recognized by consciousness or by observation, and is not a matter of revelation, it is, therefore, a mere assumption, a proposition confessedly incapable of proof. Why, then, should this dogma be insisted on, to the disturbance of religious peace and fellowship?

In another part of his treatise, Prof. P. speaks thus philosophically of the "change of heart:" "This Divine renewal falls into the same plane with other phenomena, in which cause and instrument work blended to one end. The greatness of the change is not violence of change. Supernaturalness of cause is not unnaturalness in effect. Deity in the power is not miracle in the result. In material nature are not the most profound phenomena the most simple? The mightiest forces in the universe are silent forces. Who ever heard the budding of an oak? Who was ever deafened by the falling of the dew? Who was ever stunned by a solar eclipse? So it is with the august phenomena of a change of heart. So far as we know, it is the most radical change a human spirit can experience. Still a change of heart is not an unnatural change. It is never miraculous. It is not necessarily convulsive. It is not necessarily destructive of self-possession. God employs in it an instrument exquisitely adjusted to the mind of man as an intelligent and free being. Truth may act in it with an equipoise of forces as tranquil as that of gravitation in the orbits of the stars." p. 127. If all this be so, then where, I would

ask, is the need or utility of the dogma of special spiritual operations? If the Divine influence in regeneration is similar to that exerted in the phenomena of nature, there would be as much propriety in supposing a special superadded influence in the case of every seed that germinates in the earth, as in the case of every one that believes the gospel. If we say that the gospel can not be believed without added power, we would be equally justified in asserting that we can not hear or see, in any case whatever, without added Divine power. Is the sun's light and the human eye so imperfectly adjusted to each other that a special operation is needed in order to see any object? And if a *special* act of Divine power is required in every case of regeneration, what is the meaning of the above language that "God employs in it an instrument exquisitely adjusted to the mind of man as an intelligent and free being"? Or of this, that "Divine power in the change is, to all consciousness, so blended with the force of truth, that no mind can intelligently separate them." It may be equally affirmed of every phenomenon of the material universe, of which God is admitted to be the efficient cause, that his adjustments of means to ends are perfect, and that we can not separate the Divine power or presence from the instrumentalities he employs. And if the "phenomenon" of regeneration occupies a similar position, the doctrine of *special superadded* power in each particular case, would seem wholly to disappear from view, and give place to the regular action of cause and effect, means and ends, under the

general influence of that mysterious omnipresent One who sustains the universe, and in whom "we live and move and have our being."

This, indeed, would be quite a modification of the popular doctrine, but would, really, almost seem to be the view taken by Prof. P., from various statements which he makes, as when he avers that "regeneration is never miraculous," and that it is not "an unnatural change," etc. That it really occurs in perfect harmony with the laws of the human mind he, in fact, plainly and interestingly shows, as follows, when speaking of the manner in which Truth acts: "Assuming," says he, "the fact of the invariable instrumentality of Truth in regeneration as far as we know, we are prepared to observe further such intimations as the Scriptures give us respecting the *mode* in which Truth operates in the change.

"Here, again, the Bible can scarcely be said to affirm any thing except by implied assumption. One vital principle is thus affirmed: It is that of the coincidence of the operation of truth with the laws of the human mind. Truth is every-where used in the Bible precisely as men are wont to use it in persuasive speech. There is a freedom in its use; there is a skill in its use; there is a mingling of boldness and adroitness in its use; there is a studious care to adjust it to its use; there is a wise control of it, now by utterance, now by reserve, in its use by inspired minds; and there is a confidence, yes, a triumph, in their assertions of its power, which appear to assume that truth has intrinsic fitness to move a human



mind ; and if to move it, to move it aright ; and if to move it aright, to move it in genial consistency with its own laws.

“Where do we find in the Scriptures disparagement of Truth as a power over unregenerated mind? Where is the proof that the Divine choice of it as an instrument was arbitrary? Where is a hint given of its being a fictitious or a factitious means to the end it is used for? Why should we search for it as for hidden treasure, if intrinsically it has no worth, or if any other instrument divinely chosen could be as worthy? That is not a salutary faith which depreciates the inherent potency of truth. Divine sovereignty gains no honor, and needs none, from the reproach of its instrument. Are God and Truth rivals in our esteem? That is not a rational fear, then, which shrinks from ‘means’ of regeneration, and especially from ‘natural means.’ Not so do we read the word of God.

“The usages of scriptural appeal are conclusive in their implications on this topic. How do inspired men preach? They reason with men; they invite men; they instruct men; they urge men; they entreat men; they warn men; they accumulate and reiterate all the legitimate arts of persuasion in addressing men; as if *men*, regenerate or unregenerate, elect or non-elect, were proper subjects of persuasion; as if they were complete *men* in their endowments; and therefore as if it were the normal action of their being to obey the truth. The Bible assumes that man every-where, under all conditions

of probation, has intellect which can receive truth, sensibilities which can respond to truth, a will which can act in view of truth and act aright. So far as the philosophy of the operation of truth is concerned, we can not see that the Scriptures make any distinction between fallen and unfallen mind. We can not discover that the methods of speech chosen by Isaiah, Paul, John, are not precisely the same in addressing men before regeneration as after. What is the difference? Where is the proof of it?

“Nothing but the necessities of a philosophical theory can extract from the Scriptures the dogma that truth is an instrument arbitrarily chosen by divine wisdom, or chosen for unknown reasons, or chosen for no perceptible fitness to move, and move aright, the most guilty and hopeless specimen of depraved mind. True, inspiration preserves a wise silence, in direct instruction, on the whole subject of the philosophy of regeneration; but its assumptions of the correspondence between truth and mind are as unqualified as the boldest assertions could be. So versatile is its use of truth, so many-sided does truth appear in inspired forms, so affluent in its resources, so intricate in its evolutions, yet so direct in its aim, and so exultant in its consciousness of power, that we can not but infer the existence of versatile and profound susceptibilities to that power in the soul to which it is addressed. So exquisite is the mutual adjustment of mind and truth as represented in the biblical forms of speech, that the entire science of persuasion might be illustrated by those

forms; even by such as are addressed to fallen, depraved, unregenerate, non-elect souls. The theory of all that the world has felt to be eloquent is realized in them.

“From the scriptural uses of truth, therefore, we can not but infer that in regeneration its action is perfectly normal to the soul. Truth and mind, in this divine change, come together not as metals held in a vice and riveted; they come as light and the optic nerve. Like seeks its like. Truth acts thus not by contravention, not even by suspension, of the laws of fallen mind. It acts in harmony with those laws, in obedience to those laws, by means of those laws. They are laws which no fall can dislocate. No degree of guilt can suspend them.”

These eloquent utterances of Prof. Phelps, I have given in full, on account of their philosophical justness, and their bearing on the question under consideration. From these, we should certainly infer, that, as truth and mind ‘come together, like light and the optic nerve;’ and, that as Truth acts ‘in harmony with the laws of mind,’ and in obedience to these laws, all that is in any case, needed, is to bring mind and Truth into communication, in order to the accomplishment of all desired results. Prof. Phelps, however, is careful to add: “Truth is then God’s instrument in effecting a change which it never could of itself effect.” But where is the necessity of such a reservation as this? Is it to make room for the popular notion of superadded Divine power in regeneration, without which all the adapta-

tions and delicate adjustments of mind and truth are supposed to be unavailing? Instrument and agent are here considered apart, just as we might consider the instrumentalities through which God works in Nature, apart from God. So far as any practical question is concerned, there can be no necessity for such a separation, and no utility in it. Especially is it out of place where truth, the instrument in regeneration, is directly addressed, by God himself, to intelligent and moral beings; and when the power, the authority, the wisdom, the veracity, and the revealed love of God, constitute, as in the gospel, *the very truth itself by which the effect is to be produced*. The gospel is a revelation of God, deriving its power from the very fact that it embodies in it the power, wisdom, goodness, and authority of God. From these, it is utterly impossible to separate the Gospel, as a proclamation of pardon to guilty rebels, on the part of the King, eternal, immortal, and invisible. The authority from whence it issues, is an essential part of the proclamation itself, and that alone which can give meaning or significance to its terms. Whatever separation may be made in the mind or otherwise, as to truths natural, or mathematical, there is certainly no place for any separation here, and no room for any philosophy which implies superadded power to that which is already "the power of God," or imagines an "energizing" of that truth, which, could it be conceived as in any degree devoid of energy, would, that very moment, to the same extent, equally cease to be truth. It is well and truly observed by

Prof. Phelps, that "inspiration preserves a wise silence in direct instruction on the whole subject of the philosophy of regeneration," and it is a thousand pities that theology had not imitated this wise reserve. Had it even, in propounding its philosophy, claimed for it nothing more than the human authority on which it rests; had it set it forth merely as an opinion or hypothesis, designed to connect or explain certain facts, its introduction and discussion would have been less injurious. It is, however, by far the worst feature connected with this speculation of "special spiritual operations," that it is brought forward, not as a mere philosophy, but as a *dogma*; that it is insisted on often as a part of Divine truth itself; made prominent on all occasions; dragged into all discussions; injected into the most irrelevant treatises, and so urged upon the attention of the religious community, as largely to monopolize the interest which attaches to the gospel itself, and even to induce those who earnestly advocate it, to arrogate to themselves almost an exclusive claim to the title of "evangelical." It is a pity that men's minds should have been so perverted by this theory, or that they should with so much complacency take it for granted that it is the *only* philosophy which can explain regeneration. If certain facts connected with this subject could be explained *upon this theory alone*, there might be some apology for the persistency with which it is urged. These, however, are explicable upon principles of a different nature, entirely consonant with scripture, reason, and experience.

## CHAPTER XIV.

The Gospel a Divine Message—A Person and not Doctrines the object of Faith—Christianity, a Life—Parable of the Sower—Obstacles to the reception of the Gospel—Their Removal—Theories of Conversion unnecessary—Full Assurance of Faith—Influences of the Spirit, External, Internal.

THE dispute about regeneration has been constantly incumbered with ambiguities. Sometimes the power by which it is effected, is termed *physical*. Sometimes it is represented as *moral*; while, occasionally, the epithet *spiritual* is regarded as more appropriate. Again, this power itself, however designated, is conceived at one time as absolute and independent, and, at another, as relative or conditional. At one moment, "Truth" is represented to be indispensable, and to be as admirably fitted to act upon the human heart as light upon the optic nerve; at another, this truth can do nothing "of itself," but must receive special power from an extrinsic source. The mere mechanical relation of instrument and agent, is adopted as a complete representation of the connection which exists between the gospel and its Author; and the limited applicability of figures drawn from material things, is allowed to

narrow and to falsify the interpretation of spiritual truths.

Even learned and eloquent dissertations upon the power of truth but serve to create or sustain error, when they contemplate the gospel as merely truth, or as truth in the abstract. The gospel is not only truth, but it is "*the* truth." It is not this, however, in any abstract or philosophical sense ; nor can philosophical reasonings about the power of truth, have any thing but a limited application here ; for the "word of truth," that which is termed "the word of the truth of the gospel" (Col. i. v.), and which is "the power of God to salvation," is not thus characterized as to its *quality*, but as to its *substance*. Its power resides not in any supposed influence which "truth" may have upon the mind, but in the fact that it is itself an authoritative proclamation, a special overture, a Divine message to men. It presents no symbol of doctrinal "truth" to the intellect ; but reveals facts which address themselves to the heart. It sets forth no system of theology for the mental delectation of the theorist ; but exhibits to view a Divine *person*, upon whom may rest the trust and the affections of the soul. In a word, it is God's power, not because it possesses, in common with every thing that is, the quality of truth, but because it reveals HIM who is "the way, the truth, and the life." Hence the philosophy which would resolve it into an abstraction, or install mere *verity* in the place of a living, loving Saviour ; or substitute any intellectual contemplation for a direct, personal, and

practical faith in Jesus of Nazareth, clearly fails to reach any adequate conception of the subject.

The gospel, then, is the power of God for salvation, but it is such to him only who believes it ; and the question before us now, relates to the production of this belief. Few who admit the truth of Christianity at all, have the hardihood to assert, that the evidences to the truth of the gospel are insufficient, or that a sincere belief of its facts and declarations may not spring from its evidences, just as belief in other cases arises from adequate testimony. Theology, however, attempts to depreciate the *quality* of this belief ; to decry it as merely "historical," and to claim, for a true and saving faith, that it can be produced *only* by a special act of Divine power. All the fine things said of the tendency of truth to convert the soul, and of the tendencies in the soul to yield to truth, amount to nothing. All these tendencies are supposed to be overborne, and it is affirmed, to use the language of Prof. Phelps, that "the suasive working of truth when not energized by the grace of God, is a failure." It is this supposed "energizing of truth," this efficient superaddition of Divine power to the gospel, which forms the very marrow of modern popular divinity. It does not, indeed, pretend to explain the nature of this added power, or to determine whether it is added to the truth itself or to the evidences of the truth. It merely excludes from the "operation" all human instrumentalities and expedients, and affirms it to be wholly Divine. But 'what this Divine act is, what this power is, the Scriptures,'



they say, 'do not teach,' and men are therefore left to gather their notions of it from observation or experience. The Scriptures, however, are as silent in respect to the *existence* of such superadded power as they are in regard to its nature; and the entire theory is hence a mere assumption, devoid of any Scripture proof. Even regarded in its true light, as a human philosophy of conversion, it fails to afford any rational explanation of the admitted fact, that a part only of those who hear the gospel are saved by it; since it attempts to resolve one difficulty by supposing a greater one—a special and immediate act of Divine power which "energizes" an ineffective gospel. A correct view of the subject, on the other hand, does not need to invoke the aid of miracles as a means of escape from difficulty, while it will be found to leave abundant room for influences both Divine and human, and to be entirely consistent both with Scripture and experience.

It may be observed, here, in regard to converting power, that it is not, any more than gospel truth, to be resolved into an abstraction and contemplated apart from all that is distinctive, as if all power were one. Such conceptions can exist in the mind alone, and have no place among realities, or in the word of God. It is owing largely to such vain generalizations, and the false reasonings based upon them in theology, that so much confusion of thought prevails in religious society. Nothing can be more evident than that power is various. It may be mechanical, chemical, logical, vital, etc., and each species of power acts

within its own appropriate sphere, and according to its own nature. Mechanical power may prepare the soil for the reception of the seed, but it is vital power alone which can enable that seed to germinate. No one could stay the rising tide by the power of logic or of rhetoric, nor could any one erect a palace by the force of chemical affinity. Christianity is essentially a *life*. Its processes are vital processes, and are hence most appropriately compared with similar ones in those kinds of life familiar to men. An induction into it is thus a regeneration; or it is an engrafting into the good olive, in order to participation in its "fatness." Again, the gospel, presented to the human heart, is compared to seed, scattered upon the ground from the hand of the sower, and, in considering its fortunes, it is not the reveries of speculative theology, but the analogies of nature that must be our guide.

Again, it is to be considered that power of every kind is *relative*, and is to be estimated according to the circumstances and conditions under which it acts. It may be inefficient, merely because it is insufficient; or because it is not suited to the end, or properly applied; or because its action is hindered by obstacles, which require some other species of power for their removal. Thus, in the parable of the sower, four different classes of cases are distinguished, in each of which the result varies. Yet in all, the sower was the same; and the power of germination and development on the part of the seed was the same. The seed which fell by the wayside, had just the same

ability to germinate and grow, as that which fell into the good ground. The difference in result, was simply owing to the difference of the conditions in each case, and is not to be explained upon the absurd hypothesis that, in the one, the seed was specially "energized," and, in the other, left entirely to itself. Now the gospel is just as perfect as the seed to which it is here compared; and, like the latter, neither requires nor can receive any positive augmentation of the particular kind of power which naturally resides in it. The difference in the results which follow its presentation, are due then, not to any deficiency in itself, but to the different states of the hearts in which it is "sown." The hearts of men are not here represented, by the Great Teacher, as all in one condition of "total depravity," as many now teach; but as in different conditions; some utterly unreceptive like the hard and beaten pathway; others shallow and unretentive like the stony ground, while yet others are surcharged with worldly cares which choke the word and render it unproductive. On the other hand, some are found who receive the word "in an honest and good heart," and bring forth abundant fruit. Neither is there the slightest intimation here, of any superaddition of power to the seed or word, with a view of enabling it to overcome the hindrances in its way. Were the removal of these hindrances in question, it is evident that not the same, but a different "operation" would be needed in each case, adapted to the nature of the obstacle to be encountered. Such are the simple dictates of reason,

no less than the simple teachings of the word of God. *It is not any absolute increase of the power of the gospel that is needed, but the removal of the impediments which prevent its action.* And it is impossible to conceive that any "energizing,"—any added power infused into the gospel itself—could remove these impediments, since, for these, power of a nature totally different is demanded. What power, for instance, in the analogous case of the seed sown, infused into that seed, could enable it to bury itself in the soil on the beaten pathway, or deepen the stony ground, or eradicate the overmastering thorns? The power that prepares the soil for the seed must come from a different source, and be of a different nature, from that vegetative power which alone is appropriate to the seed itself, and all these notions of direct power added to the gospel, are as absurd analogically, as they are false in fact, and utterly devoid of scriptural authority.

As we have said, however, power is relative, and is to be estimated according to the conditions under which it acts. In the case of the seed sown, no increase *in it* of vegetative power could be of any avail; but the removal of the hinderances to the action of the vegetative power which it already possessed, would give to this power freedom and effectiveness. The mechanical power, which would break up the beaten pathway, remove the stones, and eradicate the thorns, would give to the living germ, contained in the seed, the opportunity to exert successfully its own peculiar power of growth and de-

velopment ; and, so far as the result was concerned, would be perfectly equivalent to an increase of power in the seed itself, (if such a thing could be conceived possible,) sufficient to overcome all obstacles.

We have, again, in 2 Cor. iv : 3, 4, another illustration of the same truths, where Paul explains the reason why the gospel does not, in certain cases, effect the salvation of those to whom it is addressed. He says : "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." \* Here the light of the gospel is said to be prevented from shining into the heart, by certain obstacles, placed in the way to intercept it, or "blind the minds of those who believe not." It is not at all intimated that the gospel is deficient in power, or that any increase of its light is needed. Its absolute or actual power was entirely adequate to the purpose for which it was designed ; and insufficient only in relation to the obstacles placed in the way. These obstacles it could neither surmount nor remove ; but this inability would be unjustly considered as a defect in the gospel. A person, in a darkened room, would wrongfully complain that the sun was deficient in power, or

---

\*Thompson renders this passage thus : "If, therefore, even our gospel be veiled, it is veiled by those perishing things, with which the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, in order that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is an image of God, might not shine to them."

not fully adapted to enlighten the world, because his rays were unable to penetrate the closed shutters. The light of the sun is perfectly adapted to the eye, if it be allowed to reach it, and the eye itself be sound. In the case supposed, the remedy is not to be found in any increase of the sun's light, but simply in the opening of the shutters, in order that the light may enter. Paul was sent to "open the blind eyes; to turn men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God;" and the reason he gives for any failure is, that Satan prevented the light of the gospel from shining into the heart by the obstructions he interposed. Satan blinds the minds of some by riches. In other cases, his purpose is accomplished by false philosophy, or false religion, or by pride and ambition, or fleshly lusts, or some one or more of the vain and perishing things of the present world. These things he erects into hinderances or obstacles, which prevent the light of the gospel from shining into the heart. Where these do not exist, no difficulty is experienced. The word is heard, believed, and obeyed, as by the Corinthians. Acts xviii: 8. The seed which fell into "the good ground, brought forth fruit, some an hundred-fold, some sixty-fold, some thirty-fold."

Such is the picture, every-where presented in the New Testament, of the conditions under which the gospel is preached, and such are the practical illustrations constantly furnished in the "Acts of Apostles," as well as in common experience. At Antioch, the Gentiles received the gospel, but the Jews,

blinded by prejudice, rejected it. At Iconium, the apostles "so spake that a great multitude of the Jews, and also of the Greeks believed." Acts xiv: 1. The Jews of Berea were found "more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind." At Corinth, "they opposed themselves and blasphemed." But it is unnecessary to multiply proofs to show that, where the gospel fails to produce its proper effect, it is due to some specific obstacle which Satan in each case interposes, either to prevent the reception of the truth altogether, as in the case illustrated in "the seed by the wayside;" or to render its reception ineffectual, as in the case of the stony ground or that of the thorns, representing "the care of this world and the deceitfulness of riches," which "choke the word" and render it "unfruitful."

As sin has brought upon our race a vast number of distinct bodily diseases, each demanding different treatment, so, undoubtedly, has it entailed innumerable morbid mental conditions, requiring different remedies. It argues but little for the diagnostic skill of Doctors of Divinity, that they have been able to detect only a *single* universal malady; and as little for their spiritual therapeutics, that they are able to prescribe but *one* remedy. We know that many do not obey the gospel simply because they are ignorant of it. Such is the case with many of the heathen, and the proper remedy here is *instruction*. Such was the case with the Ethiopian eunuch; all that he desired and needed was information; and although

there was a "Spiritual operation" in the case, it was, unfortunately for the modern theory, not upon the eunuch, but upon *Philip*, who was thereby sent to meet him in the desert, and was afterward "caught away" to Azotus. As for the eunuch, all that seemed necessary was that Jesus should be preached to him, and, in this preaching of Jesus, *baptism* was manifestly included, since it was the *eunuch* himself who asked for baptism upon arriving at a "certain water." In other cases, it is *riches* which constitute the obstacle, as in the case of the ruler, Luke xxiii : 18, who inquired what he should do to inherit eternal life, and to whom Christ revealed the one thing needed, viz : the relinquishment of his possessions. Again, the particular hinderance may be pride, ambition, worldly honor, earthly pleasure, etc., etc. In each case, the means will wisely be adapted to the nature of the hinderance which is interposed. Adversity may abase the haughty, and prepare the heart for the truth. Riches may be made, in the Divine providence, to take to themselves wings ; or, upon a bed of suffering, the millionaire may learn the vanity of earthly things, be led to set his affections on things above, and to make to himself friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. If merely a thoughtless want of attention or youthful gayety prevent the reception of the gospel, a warning word, a kind admonition, spoken in season, may give a proper direction to the thoughts. In a thousand different ways, indeed, may the thousand obstacles which the God of this world interposes, be removed, so that the light of the



gospel will be enabled to shine into the heart and accomplish its beneficent purposes.

He, without whom not a sparrow falleth to the earth, and who has all the resources of heaven and earth at his command, can and will, if consistent with his purposes, in answer to the prayer of his people, throw around the objects of prayer such circumstances and influences as will accomplish the end in due time. Ministering angelic beings, spirits "sent forth," we are expressly told, "to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation," familiar with the laws of the spiritual nature, may doubtless guide the human mind in almost any direction, simply through its own laws of association, suggestion, or reasoning; just as the skilled pilot may guide a vessel in a particular direction, while another one, with the very same wind, is sailing in one directly opposite. In this, there is no violation, but, on the contrary, an employment of the laws and forces of nature; nor have we any right to suppose that God may not cause the hearts of men to be opened to the gospel by such a simple guiding of the trains of thought, in perfect harmony with the laws of the mind itself. Take, for instance, the conversion of Augustine. While meditating in his garden near Milan, upon the sensuality and impiety of his past life, he was filled with remorse, and the tears and prayers of his pious mother Monica, heretofore apparently unavailing, came into remembrance. In this state of feeling, he heard from a neighboring house, a young voice saying and repeating, "*Tolle lege, Tolle lege,*" *take*

*and read, take and read.* Receiving this as a Divine admonition, he returned to the place where he had left his friend Alypius to procure the roll of St. Paul's epistles, which he had a short time before left with him. "I seized the roll," says he; "I opened it and read in silence that passage on which my eyes first alighted." It was the thirteenth of Romans: "Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness; not in chambering and wantonness; not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ and make not provision for the flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof." "No further would I read," adds he, "nor needed I; for instantly, at the end of this sentence, by a light, as it were, of serenity, infused into my heart, all the darkness of doubt vanished away."—*Confessions*, p. 204. Need we wonder at the effect of *the word of God* here, falling into a heart prepared for its reception through the lifelong instruction of a pious mother; the recent earnest discourse of Pontitianus to which he had listened, and the late removal of the obstacle of Manicheism through the teachings of Ambrose? The ardent nature, and proud and subtle intellect of Augustine needed just such preparation; and no sooner were the hinderances of false religion and philosophy taken out of the way, than the truth and beauty of the gospel shone into his heart. Let it be here observed that all the influences here mentioned as acting on Augustine were *from without*, and *through words* presented to his mind; and, furthermore, that the final happy change was effected by the *word of God*

*itself.* Again, if worldly hopes and ambitions occupy the thoughts, and prove an obstacle to the entire surrender of the heart to God, we may take the case of a Luther, moved to deep reflection by the fate of his friend Alexis, and filled with the terrors of death by the flashing lightnings of a furious storm. He is thus led to renounce all worldly prospects and seek for peace in the cell of a cloister. But he finds it there, after many struggles, only in the simple assurance which *the Bible* affords of justification through faith in Christ. It is the prospect of death indeed, which, perhaps more than any other single cause, leads men to become religious. So Peter Waldo, a rich merchant of Lyons, startled by the sudden death of a friend at his table, resolves to abandon all other concerns and devote himself to religion. He distributes his wealth to the poor, circulates the Scriptures, and becomes the founder of the Society of the Waldenses. Again, it may be simply a want of careful and continued attention to the claims of the gospel, as in the case of the gay and witty Wilberforce, who, while on his way to Nice, happened to observe to his friend Milner that he thought a certain religious clergyman carried things too far. Milner said that he thought he would form a different estimate of him, were he to carefully peruse the New Testament. Wilberforce replied that he would take him at his word, and read it through with pleasure. Thus perusing the New Testament together on their journey, the mind of Mr. Wilberforce became impressed with its truths. He was revolutionized, became a

new man, and thenceforth devoted himself to the cause of religion and philanthropy.

No one, indeed, can read intelligently the accounts we have of the conversions and religious strugglings of those distinguished for piety, without perceiving that, however various attending circumstances, and however protracted the struggle, assurance and peace were at last found only from the study of the Divine Oracles, or in some Divine Scripture truth impressed at a favorable moment on the heart. It is easy to perceive how various the obstacles as well as the means to be employed for their removal, and how truly the Gospel is the power of God to salvation, when the particular hinderance to its reception is taken away. The history of these experiences forms one of the most interesting portions of the memoirs of the great and good; and their mental trials and struggles to reach the light of truth, will be regarded with earnest sympathy and affectionate interest by every Christian. These experiences are true psychological phenomena. They are doubtless often special answers to prayer. They are Divine guidings; particular interpositions, opening the eyes to see wondrous things in the law of God—things which were there before, but unseen in consequence of obstructed vision. But the prevailing error of religious society in regard to them is this: to regard them as direct operations of the Holy Spirit upon the heart of the unbeliever, “energizing” the gospel and imparting faith by “an instantaneous work;” and to attribute to these influences a saving or converting

efficacy, independent of the word of God, and the institutions of the Gospel.

For such an extreme view there is not the slightest necessity, since the facts involved admit of explanation upon principles which, while they detract not from the gospel as God's power to salvation, leave to the influences in question all that may be justly claimed for them, as designed, in God's providential and special ministry, to bring men to a knowledge of the truth, and as being a part of that wondrous system of instrumentalities, by which the Supreme Ruler directs and governs the affairs both of individuals and of nations, as strikingly shown in the book of Esther, and constantly exemplified in human history. Nor is there any need of the theory which accounts for conversion by a special "energizing" of truth; since it is apparent that the removal of obstacles to belief is equivalent, practically, to an augmentation of the intrinsic power of the gospel. The opening of the shutters of a darkened room will have precisely the same effect as if the light of the sun was increased sufficiently to penetrate the shutters. The force with which a sword is urged to pierce the heart may be unavailing, if a breastplate be interposed, but altogether adequate if that breastplate be removed. If, in the balance of the judgment, or of the affections, some worldly hope outweighs the promises of the gospel, the preponderance of the latter may be effected, not by adding to it new weight, but, more readily and simply, by the removal of that in the opposite scale.

There is, however, as formerly said, no occasion for any theories whatever on this subject. The true preacher of the gospel will, like the apostles, give himself to "prayer and to the ministry of the word," and endeavor to combine trust in Divine aid with diligence in human effort. In fulfilling his mission he will find, as in the parable of the Sower, good and honest hearts prepared to receive the truth as did the Bereans of old. If others oppose, God may, peradventure, give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth in due time, through the means fitted to remove the difficulties in their way. From the lost, the gospel will doubtless be forever hidden by the devices of the Prince of Darkness. In all cases, however, results are to be left with God; and men are to perform their prescribed duty independently of theories, being assured that the "kingdom of God is as if a man should cast seed into the ground, and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up he knoweth not how." Mark iv: 26, 27.

When hinderances to faith are removed, when an individual is enabled to see the glory of Christ as he is revealed in the gospel, and to make an entire surrender of himself to him in loving trust, it is natural that the soul, freed from its burdens and its fears, should find rest and be filled with joy and peace. This was Christ's promise to the weary and heavy-laden, who would come to him and accept his guidance. It is evident that the degree of happiness experienced by the convert, will vary with the degree

of confidence he entertains that he has obtained a personal interest in Christ, and has been justified or forgiven. The fact of his justification itself, rests, of course, in the Divine mind alone; but in the gospel, God has furnished such assurances of the fact to the believer as to relieve him of all dubiety. It was not the design that any one should be left in doubt as to his salvation, nor can there be found under apostolic preaching, a single instance of that uncertainty in regard to this, which is now so common under the influence of modern systems of religion, where the hope of acceptance is made to rest upon certain feelings of joy and peace, themselves often due to factitious circumstances, or being constituted, by an absurd inversion, the very ground of the hope from which they spring. The assurance of justification can not properly spring from our own hopes or convictions, but must proceed from a higher source, and rest upon a Divine authority. It is unfortunate, therefore, that modern religious systems, in making the feelings alone the criteria of pardon, have presumed to neglect or reject the means which God himself has appointed in order to give this assurance. An inspired apostle, in the beginning, commanded believing penitents to "be baptized for the remission of sins," with the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit upon their obedience (Acts ii: 38); and it is evident that in this obedience and in the realization of this promise, the believer received those Divine assurances of his acceptance which were alone legitimate. Paul hence indicates the primitive order of

things, when he says (Heb. x: 22), "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water;" the application, by faith, of the "blood of sprinkling" to the conscience, being here appropriately connected with the washing of the body in baptism,\* which is not a Jewish rite of mere external purification, but the "answer of a good conscience"—an expressive emblem and pledge, on God's part, to the believer, of spiritual cleansing through the atonement of Christ. That the gospel reveals a justification by faith "without deeds of law," is a doctrine most true and worthy of all acceptance. Modern system-makers seek to carry the matter still farther, and to make justification independent likewise of the institutions of the gospel itself. Without entering here into this question, it is sufficient to say, that justification is one

---

\*The opposition which Paul here institutes between the "sprinkling" of the heart and the "washing" of the body, is noteworthy, as a clear evidence that immersion alone is Christian "baptism." For it may be justly affirmed that no one thing, nor even a surface, can be washed without being *covered* or immersed in that by which it is washed. The mere sprinkling of the earth never washes it. The ground is never washed, unless the water *accumulates* so as to *cover* the surface washed. A vessel is said to be "washed," i. e., plated, with silver, only when its surface is *covered* by a film (however thin) of this metal. In every case, a covering or immersion of the thing washed is a necessary implication; and the washing of the body in pure water of which Paul here speaks, is an irrefragable proof that immersion, in which alone this "washing" could be effected, was the "baptism" of the apostolic age.



thing, and the *assurance* of justification, or the "full assurance of faith," another; and that, while obedience to the gospel can in no sense *procure* forgiveness, it may be essential to the *believer himself* as the divinely appointed means of furnishing to him this assurance.

It is in setting aside baptism for remission of sins, and in confounding the gift of the Spirit to believers with the work of the Spirit in conversion, that modern systems have deprived the sincere convert of that comfort and confidence in his profession, which was given by the primitive gospel. An overweening anxiety to secure for the unbeliever the inner "witness of the Spirit," and a habitual depreciation both of the word of God and of the institutions of the gospel, upon the ground that these are merely outward or external matters, have tended to create the impression that no influences of the Spirit are of any value except those which are exerted from within. It would seem, indeed, to be supposed that the Holy Spirit is unable to exercise any influence upon men's hearts and minds by acting upon them from without; and that, in all cases, in order to move them, he must take up his abode in their hearts. In referring to John xiv: 17, Calvin says: "The words of Christ show us that we can receive no knowledge of the Holy Spirit through merely human perception, but that he can be known only by the experience of faith—'The world,' he says, '*has no capacity to receive the Spirit because it knoweth Him not, but ye know Him, for he dwelleth with you.*' The Spirit, then,

suffers himself to be known only by taking up his abode in us; otherwise he is unknown and incomprehensible." The teaching of Calvin here is in direct opposition to that of Christ, and to the facts of Scripture. Christ says to the disciples with respect to the Spirit, "Ye know him, for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you." He was not, then, yet in them, this being a matter in the future. Nevertheless, they knew him, as Christ declares. But Calvin contradicts and says: "The Spirit suffers himself to be known only by taking up his abode in us. Otherwise he is unknown and incomprehensible." In like manner, the followers of Calvin seem to recognize no work of the Spirit in human renovation, except it proceed from the Spirit as dwelling in the heart. But the declaration of Christ in the case referred to, clearly implies an influence from without. "Ye know Him," says he to his disciples, "for he is with you." The Spirit, then, had made himself known to them simply by being *with* them, but not *in* them. The failure to make this distinction has much to do with the confusion of thought which prevails on the subject of spiritual influence.

How had the Holy Spirit been *with* the disciples? Certainly as dwelling and manifested in the person of Christ. To him the Holy Spirit had been given "without measure." In him dwelt "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." He cast out demons and wrought all miracles by the "finger," or Spirit of God. The Father dwelt in him, and he dwelt in the Father by the Spirit. "The words that I speak unto

you," said he to Philip, John xiv : 10, " I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me ; he doeth the works." The disciples had heard these " words ;" they had witnessed these " works," by which it had been proved to their hearts and minds that Jesus was the Messiah. " The same works that I do," said Jesus, " bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me." John v : 36. The Holy Spirit had thus exerted an influence of the most important and salutary nature upon these disciples, while merely *with* them, but not *in* them. This influence was exerted *from without*, by words addressed to their ears, and by miraculous evidences of an external character presented to their senses. What was the result of it ? They had become *believers*. " I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me," said Jesus in his prayer to the Father, " and they have received them and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me." They had become possessed of faith *by hearing words*, and witnessing the *proof* on which faith rests. No one can pretend it was by a special internal operation of the Spirit " working faith in the heart," according to the modern notion, for the Spirit was not yet *in* them, but only *with* them. Christ had indeed conferred upon them power to work miracles, but this, as has been shown, had nothing to do with the indwelling of the Spirit, any more than in the case of the rod of Moses ; the waters of Jordan in healing Naaman, or the bones of Elisha in raising the dead to life. The entire result, in the case of

the disciples, is expressly attributed *to the words spoken to them*, confirmed, as they were, by the external evidences of miraculous power. We have here, then, an influence of the Spirit, exerted *from without*, producing saving faith, constituting individuals disciples of Christ, and separating them from the world. Here is a state of facts, clearly revealed, which can never be explained or accounted for on the principles of those who admit but internal influences of the Spirit and deny the possibility of true faith without a "special internal spiritual operation."

But the result of this external influence of the Spirit—of these "words" of the Spirit, spoken by Christ in the ears of the disciples, was not only faith, but also purification. "Ye are clean," said he, "through the words which I have spoken unto you." Well could he, therefore, say to them on one occasion, "Blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear." It was "given" to them to know the truth because they did not, like the Pharisees, close their eyes to the light, and harden their hearts against the teaching of Christ. Hence said Jesus to the Father, "I have given them thy words and they have received them." They were accordingly prepared to receive the Holy Spirit, their hearts "having been purified by faith" in Jesus.

We have now, in the case of these disciples, a perfect exemplification of the actual state of the case in reference to all who have since been brought to Christ. All have heard the gospel, the same gospel which Jesus preached, and have had presented to

their minds the same external evidences of his Messiahship, furnished by the Holy Spirit, by which the primitive disciples were convinced, and which are faithfully recorded or "written," that all in successive ages might believe the same great truth, and believing this, obtain life through the name of Christ. In all these cases, the Holy Spirit was *with* them but not *in* them. He has been with them in his words presented to them; with them in those who spoke to them the word of God; with them in every sense in which he was with the primitive believers; and, as in their case, by operating from without, by words, by the gospel of Christ which is God's power to salvation, brought them all to a knowledge of the truth, and purified their hearts by faith, so that they were prepared to receive, upon obedience, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, as an indwelling presence to abide with them forever.

The work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men hence naturally divides itself into two chapters—

1. The influence He exerts *from without* in the production of faith and conversion; and,
2. The influence he exerts *from within*, as the Comforter, Helper and Sanctifier of the obedient believer.

The advocates of the popular theory of "spiritual operations," fail to make this distinction. They seem, as formerly remarked, to have little idea of any spiritual influence but as exerted in conversion, and that, too, from within, by an actual presence of the Spirit in the unbeliever, contrary to the word of God. It is a pity that the peace of religious society should be

disturbed, and the progress of the gospel hindered by a theory of "spiritual operations" which leads men to disparage the word of God as inefficient, so that the very revelation which the Spirit makes of sin, righteousness and judgment for the purpose of converting the world, is disregarded, in the pursuit of direct internal influences which, so far as they are genuine, appertain exclusively to believers. The work of the Spirit, as this relates to the world, being thus confounded with his work as it relates to saints, the anxious inquirer is unable to obtain a clear idea of either, or to ascertain what is really required of him. It is lamentable that a human theory should be allowed to place the Spirit in opposition to his own work; to exalt one part of his work against another; misplace the promises and Divine order of the gospel, and so pervert the minds of men, that they will not receive the plain teaching of the Spirit himself in the Sacred Scriptures. Why should the influence of the Spirit, exerted *from without*, through the gospel, not be as highly esteemed and as earnestly pressed as his influence *from within*? Why should the difference in the relations which the sinner and the saint respectively sustain to God, be wholly overlooked or disregarded? Why should the attempt be made to apply to the one those means of renovation which have been Divinely appropriated to the other? Alas! it is nothing but the tyranny of a theological theory which requires this, for it has been diligently inculcated, as the very basis of all religion, that such is the nature and con-

dition of man that nothing but a direct internal operation of the Spirit can enable any one to believe. Theory first establishes a mountain of "total hereditary depravity" directly in the way of the gospel, and then demands, as a matter of necessity, a miracle for its removal! In opposition to all this, however, the Scriptures teach that men are to "hear the word of the gospel and believe;" that they are "regenerated by the incorruptible seed of the word;" that God begets his children "by the word of truth," and that while it is impossible for the unbelieving world to receive the Spirit, "because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him," God will ever, according to his gracious promise, give the Holy Spirit "to them that obey him." To reveal Christ to the mind and heart, through the gospel, is thus the office of the Spirit, as it respects the world; while, dwelling in the heart of the believer, he there establishes the reign of peace, and joy, and love, bringing forth in the life the blessed fruits of righteousness, and preparing the renewed soul for the blissful enjoyment of the eternal inheritance.











**DATE DUE**[illegible]

DEMCO 38-297

THE BURKE LIBRARY



5 0269 687

Richardson, R.

A Scriptural View of the  
Office of the Holy Spirit

RT4  
R52

DATE

7/16/49

R. A.

ISSUED TO

MAR 14  
1953

*Jan*

The Library  
Union Theological Seminary  
Broadway at 120th Street  
New York 27, N. Y.

